GOODWIN'S

Christian Eschatology.

BT
821
.G662

Library of Princeton
AUG 11 1885
Theological Seminary

BT 821 .G662
Goodwin, Daniel R. 1811-
1890.
Christian eschatology, or
doctrine of the last things

CHRISTIAN ESCHATOLOGY,

OR

Doctrine of the Last Things;

BY THE

REV. DANIEL R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.,

Church of the Holy Trinity Professor of Systematic Divinity, in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in Philadelphia.

PHILADELPHIA:
McCalla & Stavely, Prs., 237-239 Dock St.
1885.

Library of Princeton
AUG 11 1
Theological Seminary

PREFACE.

To make an apology for the manifold faults and shortcomings of the following production would require more space than a preface of moderate length would afford. For only one thing is an apology offered,—for issuing a work on Eschatology at all. There are many in these days who have come to think that religion is concerned only with the present life, and has nothing to do with a future world; so that they regard a discourse on Eschatology as theoretical and antiquated, unpractical and obsolete. It is true that such a view involves a total revolution, not only of "traditional" theology, but of the whole teaching of Christ and his Apostles. And what we have to say, is, that, in such a matter, truth does not change; what was true in the days of Jesus Christ is true now, inexorably true; no matter whether or not it be agreeable to the popular ear, or find approval with the newspaper theologians and the free and easy thinkers "of to-day." Men may reject, revile, crucify, an unwelcome truth; but they cannot destroy it. It will rise again at the last day,—if not before.

EASTERTIDE, 1885.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Immortality, ... 3

The Intermediate State; or the State immediately after Death, ... 7

Christ's Second Coming, ... 11

The Resurrection, ... 17

The Judgment of the Last Day, ... 23

Probation after Death, ... 27

Eternal Life, ... 32

Eternal Punishment, ... 40

Universalism, ... 59

Annihilation, or Conditional Immortality, . . 68

APPENDIX: Excursus (1) on αἰώνιος (eternal), . 74

" (2) on κόλασις (punishment), 77

" (3) on Hell (γέεννα), . . 78

CORRIGENDA.

In the earlier pages a few errors have been left in the citations from Scripture.

Page 5, line 31, for (Ps.) 13 read (Ps.) 63.

Page 12, line 15, for 2 Cor. 3 read 2 Cor. 4.

Page 13, line 18, for Matt. 21 : 51 read Matt. 21 : 5.

Page 13, line 2 from bottom, after 3 put a comma instead of the period.

IMMORTALITY.

I.

Introductory Propositions.

1. By immortality is meant life after death, the unending continuance of man's conscious personal existence. The so-called immortality of the race is only an immortality of the *brutes that perish*. An immortality of influence or of fame is no more than a *physical echo*. The Nirvana is an immortality of *nothingness*—not an annihilation of man's very substance, it may be, but an absolute ending and swallowing up of all conscious personality.

2. Human death is the separation of soul and body. The existence of our bodies we know by our senses, of our souls by our consciousness; and, as thus known, we apprehend them as totally diverse. We observe death in others, and, judging by analogy with ourselves, we perceive it to be this separation of soul and body. The hypothesis of materialism, that the soul is only life, the result of organization, or a quality of some peculiar kind of matter, is inconsistent with sound philosophy and true science—as well as with all religion. There is an impassable chasm, fully admitted by many of the best scientists, between any sensible or imaginable movements or activities or properties of matter and the conscious acts of the rational soul.

3. After death the body is dissolved; but this dissolution is not properly death, nor any part of it; it is a consequence of death.

4. We do not know by experience or observation, nor can we in any way prove, that the soul is likewise after death dissolved or destroyed or annihilated. We cannot follow it beyond the moment of death. We only know it is gone. Even the body is not annihilated, either at or after death, and the soul, as immaterial, cannot be dissolved, being an absolute monad, a conscious unity of being. As to Bishop Butler's suggestion, on the hypothesis of its materiality, of its being an ultimate particle of matter, and therefore indissoluble by any force in nature, though it might not be easy to answer, we need not stop to consider it.

II.

Immortality, or Life after Death, Proved from Nature and Reason.

It is not well that these proofs or indications (*indicia*), though they do not claim to be either demonstrative or absolutely conclusive, should be despised, discredited or ignored. They have been *recognized* by nearly all, and are, in fact, *assumed* by all, who really believe in personal immortality.

1. The powers of the soul are adapted to and demand a higher state and sphere of being and action than they find in the present world,—man is capable of indefinite development. This is the *natural anticipation* of a future life.

2. There is a fitness and a craving of the soul for a higher happiness than can be attained here :—The *natural aspiration* of the good after a higher and more perfect state.

3. The conscience, the moral nature, with the hopes of the good, and the fears of the wicked, points to a future state, and the sense of justice demands an ultimate *righteous retribution.*

4. A future life has been more or less distinctly *believed* in in *all ages* and among *all nations.* Philosophy could never prove its truth as a certain fact ; but neither could skepticism ever extinguish the natural presentiment.

5. It may be added that the soul now lives ; therefore it will *continue* to live forever, unless something positive puts an end to its being. This throws the burden of proof on the other side. But, as we have seen, it cannot be *shown* that death destroys it ; and, if not death, then nothing else is pretended to have that effect.

As for the souls of brute animals, we need neither disprove nor deny their existence in a future state. It is enough that there is not the same positive reason for it, either from nature or from revelation, as there is for the immortality of man. It is a great, but very common mistake to suppose that this argument from *continuance* cannot be used without admitting that there is the same evidence, the same likelihood, of the immortality of beasts as of the immortality of man. True, we cannot prove that the beasts are not immortal ; but it does not

follow from this that they are, only that they *may* be. We cannot prove that death will be their destruction, yet it *may* be ; and so of man, too, if there were no further proof. The argument from *continuance* simply removes *a priori* assumptions, and establishes an *a priori possibility*—not a *probability*. It does not affirm that that which lives will continue to live until one can *show* that something will put an end to its life ; but that, till then, it *may* live for aught we know. But because it may live for aught we know it does not follow that it will. For this we want some positive proof or probability. In man's case we have it ; in the case of the beast we have it not. That *any* man should commit murder is not impossible or incredible, but this does not show that the judge on the bench, with not a particle of positive evidence against him, is as likely to have committed it as the prisoner in the dock, with two good witnesses testifying to his guilt.

III.

Immortality proved from Scripture.

1. In the Old Testament it is more or less distinctly assumed or implied all along ; although some passages seeming to teach the contrary need to be explained, as in Job 14. 7–12, and in Psalms 49. 19–20 ; 39. 12–13 ; 88. 10–12.

2. For more distinct recognition see the case of Enoch, of "Moses at the Bush," Luke 20, 37–38 ; Mark 12. 26–27, the prevalent practice of necromancy, the idea of Sheol, the "pilgrim" lives of the patriarchs, &c., Heb. 11 ; also Job 14. 13–15 ; 19. 23–27 ; Psalms 17. 15 ; 16. 8–11 ; 13. 24–26 ; Eccles. 3. 21 ; 12. 7 ; Isaiah 26. 19 ; Daniel 12. 2–3.

3. In the Old Testament Scriptures, there is—it is true, comparatively little about a *future retribution*. In them the corporate and national overshadows the individual ; the rewards and punishments belong to this life. Hence a future life is less openly and frequently referred to, and often but darkly and dimly apprehended.

4. But the doctrine of a future life and retribution is beyond all question taught in the New Testament—personal life and personal retribution. "Life and immortality are brought to light" in the Gospel. So that, if there be no future life for man, Jesus Christ is a myth

and the Gospel a blunder—a lunatic's dream. The scientist's immortality of the race cannot be framed into it, nor an immortality of re-echoing influence, nor an absorption into the Deity. To Christianity the last enemy to be destroyed is death. And it is one of the strangest phenomena of modern thought that a system of Christian dogmatics (mythical) should conclude with declaring that "the future life—*das Jenseits*—is the last enemy to be destroyed in human thought and theology." Such is the glorious pæan of Christian infidelity.

Some have thought that immortality is not natural to man, but is a superadded gift of Divine grace; or that, being lost by the fall, it has been restored to the whole race by Jesus Christ. But in either case immortality still belongs to every man *as man*—as surely as he is born—as inseparably as any attribute or endowment of his nature,—no man ever existed, or ever will exist, without it. And thus, on this theory, the distinction between nature and grace—on which distinction the theory is founded—is totally annulled.

Others have maintained that immortality depends upon the spiritual quality or essence which has been bestowed upon men by the special agency of the Divine Logos "which lighteth every man coming into the world." But not only is the Logos the source and author of spiritual light, but He is the Creator of man's very being and the Giver of all his powers of whatever kind, for "by him were all things made, and without him was not any thing made that is made." Not only man's highest spiritual attributes, but all his intellectual and rational powers are from God. "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty hath given him understanding." But, as man's understanding belongs to his nature, and is not any special gift of the Logos, or of God's grace, so also with man's highest spiritual essence, considered as a part of his proper constitution, and so, consequently, with his immortality. These are as truly natural as the other. They are all God's good gifts, but they are His natural gifts, bestowed upon all men as men, and not the gifts of His special grace; —otherwise, again, the very distinction between nature and grace is annulled.

The theory of "conditional immortality" is reserved for consideration in the sequel.

THE INTERMEDIATE STATE; OR THE STATE IMMEDIATELY AFTER DEATH.

The former expression implies the assumption of the subsequent resurrection of the body. In case of assuming, as we do, for all after the resurrection, but two distinct states, one of happiness and the other of misery,—and no third state is so much as hinted at anywhere in Holy Scripture,—the idea of an intervening *purgatory* is a natural prejudice. Something of the sort could not fail, therefore, of being invented. See the *purging fire* of some of the Fathers, the full-blown figment of Romish superstition and priestcraft, the visions and phantasies of Swedenborg, and the recent suggestions of Canon Farrar.

But, in fact, the doctrine of purgatory, under almost any form of conception, is inconsistent in its very principle with the true idea of salvation by Christ. We have our justification and our sanctification in him, and by him, through the grace and power of the Holy Spirit, freely and fully and without any merits of our own.

This feeling of the necessity of an intervening purgatory for imperfect Christians—and almost all Christians are consciously imperfect—arises, not only from assuming that every man must either atone for his own sins or suffer their penalty, in short, must stand upon his own moral deserts, but from viewing the case in the light of purely natural morality, or, we might almost say, of a kind of physical ethics. Men seem to forget that the Holy Spirit may, and often does, produce rapid, fundamental and permanent changes in human character by processes which cannot be fully explained on the principles of mere natural ethics. Moreover, what our problem requires is not an instantaneous transformation into a state of absolute moral and spiritual perfection at the moment of death, but only that the fundamental principle of the character, the main purpose of the will, the controlling bent of the affections, be in the right direction. Only let the dying saint—or sinner, which-

ever you may choose to call him—be in such a state that he is ready to seek and enjoy as his highest happiness the immediate presence and intimate communion of his blessed Lord, and he will then have such a means and such a pledge and assurance of going forward to spiritual perfection as no pains of purgatorial fires could ever afford. And if such a state of mind and heart do not exist at death, no pains or fires of purgatory would be likely to produce it. Whoever cordially chooses the bosom of his Saviour when he dies, to him, we may believe, that bosom is open. It is passing strange to hear from Protestant or Anglican lips the suggestion that the Romish purgatory is a relief to Protestant rigor, that it presents a milder and more comforting view than the strict doctrine of the Reformation,—especially when we consider that even to that gloomy prison only the *baptized* are received, all the rest being summarily consigned to everlasting perdition. And even for the baptized, are the torments of those purging fires indeed to be commended as more mild and comforting than the free grace of the Gospel and the blessed presence and communion of Christ? the echoing of those sighs and groans sweeter than the vòice : "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise?"

For this doctrine of purgatory there is not the slightest basis in Holy Scripture. The Scripture speaks of the fiery trial of persecution and suffering (1 Peter 1, 7 ; 4, 12), of being baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire (Luke 3,16), of the testing fire of the last great day (1 Cor. 3, 13), and of the unquenchable fire of Gehenna (Matt. 3, 12 ; Mark 9, 45, etc.); but it will scarcely be pretended that either or any of these means the fires of purgatorial torment in the intermediate state. And to rest the doctrine of such a purgatory upon its *analogy* to the known and admitted purifying effects of affliction and suffering in this life is, on the spot, to confess it to be a sheer invention, without any positive foundation in Scripture. The argument is, "it might be a good and useful thing if it existed, and therefore it exists." And such, in fact, has been its historical genesis. The doctrine could not be proved by any *catena patrum*, if such it had ; but it has no such catena of opinions. The primitive fathers knew nothing of it. No Catholic creed confesses it. The Liturgy and Articles of our Church

have no trace of it. The Twenty-second Article condemns it.

But, though there be no purgatory, yet, if there be a future general resurrection, there is, of course, a state of souls intermediate between death and that resurrection; and, if so, those souls are somewhere,—in some finite place, and that place would seem to be properly neither heaven nor hell; their state being neither the consummation of final blessedness in the beatific vision, nor the hopeless torments of Gehenna. That Hades or Paradise is such a place is altogether different from the doctrine of purgatory. In fact, it involves the most direct contradiction to such a doctrine.

The Scriptural outlines of this intermediate state may be given as follows:

(1) It is a state of consciousness, not of sleep.

It is true, death is, in the Scriptures, frequently called sleep. But this is beyond question figurative language; and the same figure is familiar in our every-day discourse, and in all languages. The Scripture seems to delight in it in speaking of the death of the righteous; and how beautifully appropriate and comforting it is as denoting their blissful rest and peace! But, in the New Testament it is never, I believe, applied to the death of the wicked. Our Lord distinguishes expressly between the figurative sleep and the literal death. He said to his disciples, "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth;" and when he saw that he was misunderstood, "he said to them *plainly* Lazarus is dead." That is, he spoke now openly and without a figure. St. Paul says that "to depart and be with Christ is far better." But could such a man as the heroic Apostle Paul think a state of unconscious sleep better than the privilege of preaching the Gospel of the blessed God, or even of suffering for Christ's sake? The parable of the rich man and Lazarus, if it means anything at all, would seem to imply unequivocally that the soul is in a state of consciousness after death.

(2) The saints are in Paradise with the Lord.

This was our Lord's promise to the thief on the cross: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." They would then both be departed spirits. St. Paul says that "whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord," and, "when we are absent from the body we are present—at home—with the Lord." Striking it is

that, here, "the Lord" and "the body" are presented as direct alternatives. Does this intimate that as we are here immediately conscious of the presence of our bodies, so we shall there be as intimately conscious of the immediate presence of the Lord? Will he be to us, as it were, instead of our bodies, and communion with him instead of communion with all sensible objects? If so, what glorious and unspeakable blessedness! That presence, as being with disembodied spirits, will of course not be a bodily presence, but a presence of gracious spiritual manifestation and intimate personal communion. In his own spiritual body and proper humanity, Christ is in heaven at the right hand of God, and will there remain until he returns to judge all men at the last day.

(3) The wicked are in torment in Hades.

"The rich man also died and was buried, and in Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments."

(4) The place of all departed spirits, both good and bad, may also be called Sheol or Hades, in the larger sense of the word; but, in a narrower sense and more frequent usage, Hades may designate the place of intermediate punishment of the wicked (not Gehenna, however), as contradistinguished from Paradise, or from "those heavenly habitations (not properly heaven, however), where the souls of those who sleep in the Lord Jesus enjoy perpetual rest and felicity." "Hades" presents the gloomy, and "Paradise" the blissful side of the scene. The latter viewed as a part of Hades is yet separated from the other part by a fixed, impassable chasm. But Paradise, with all its blissful rest and peace and spiritual communion, is not "the perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul in the eternal and everlasting glory." There must still remain room for the "glorious hope" of the final resurrection and the beatific vision. The "Paradise" and the "third heaven" of St. Paul's rapture may have been, and probably were, distinct places.

CHRIST'S SECOND COMING.

That there is to be a Second Advent of Christ, a second and glorious appearance at the end of the world, to raise the dead, to judge mankind, and to superintend the final consummation of all things, is a frequent topic in our Lord's teaching and in that of his Apostles; and has been a part of the faith of the Church in all ages. Matt. 16. 28; 24. 3, 27, 30, 37, 39, 42; 25. 31; 26. 64; John 14. 3, 28; 21. 22; Acts 1. 11; 1 Cor. 1. 7; 4. 5; 11. 26; 15. 23; 1 Thess. 1. 10; 2. 19; 3. 13; 4. 15, 16; 5. 23; 2 Thess. 1. 10; 2. 1, 8; 1 Tim. 6. 14; 2 Tim. 4. 1; James 5. 7, 8; 2 Pet. 1. 16; 3. 4; &c., &c.

Christ may be said to come to each one at the hour of his death; he is said to come in any great visitation of general trial or affliction to the Church, to nations, or to mankind; especially he is said to come at the destruction of Jerusalem. But these are only figurative applications of the phrase; and the last is familiarly employed as the symbol of his great and final coming.

Of that coming no man knows the day or hour. In his human nature Christ himself did not know. That knowledge, he said, was reserved to the Father (Matt. 24. 36),—a reservation which was still continued after his resurrection (Acts 1. 7). Yet he had as much of the prophet Daniel as we have. It was as much his duty, therefore (if we may use the term), to study out the prophetic numbers and ascertain their results in regard to the times and the seasons, as it is ours. And is it likely that He revealed to his servant John what He had not Himself known?

The early Christians, and even the Apostles, may have thought the Second Advent much nearer than it was. Inspiration does not involve omniscience; and on this subject they had no revelation; if they *thought* on it at all, they were left, like us, to their own speculations or probable judgment. But in neither their oral nor written teaching did they ever undertake to tell *how* near that coming was or is. They regarded it as *near*, and they

declared it to be near; and so we ought to regard it, and so it is. If it was not so near as they thought it, it may be much nearer than we are prone to think it. St. Peter insists on its certainty, evidently regarding it as near at hand; yet he gives us a guiding principle which should never be lost sight of: "that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." So St. Paul, having in his first epistle to the Thessalonians used the phrase: "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," and finding that his language was misconstrued, earnestly exhorts them, in his second epistle: "that they should not soon be shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit nor by word, nor by letter as from him, as that the day of Christ was at hand." And at 2 Cor. 3. 14, he expressly reckons himself among those who should be "raised up" from the dead. He knew not whether he should live unto the coming of the Lord or should die before; and in regard to ourselves, we are in the same ignorance.

In further discussing this subject, there are certain views more or less prevalent which will require examination:

(1) Christ's kingdom—the kingdom of heaven—is not now in progress, but he is waiting for it.

(2) The theory of Christ's pre-millennial advent, and his presumed visible reign here on this temporal and natural earth,—with or without a restoration of the Jews to Palestine. Or,

(3) That the resurrection and reign of the just will be at a period quite distinct from and long antecedent to the final judgment,—the παρουσία (the coming) being different from the ἐπιφάνεια (the appearing).

We may not consider these views strictly in order; but all the points will be covered in the following argument.

For the doctrine of our Church, see Article IV, the Advent Collects, the three Creeds, the *Te Deum*, and the Burial Service. Our Church plainly knows of no Second Advent of Christ, except his "Coming to judge all men at the last day," "When every eye shall see him, and they also that pierced him."

That Christ's mediatorial kingdom is now in progress, that the general resurrection both of the just and unjust shall be at one coming of Christ, and *that* immediately before the one general and final judgment, appears from

the detailed and formal statements of 1 Cor. 15. 23–26, and 52–54. Thus (*a*) Christ must reign until all enemies are put under his feet; (*b*) the last enemy to be destroyed is death; (*c*) death is subdued when the saints are raised; and (*d*) when death is subdued the mediatorial or Messianic kingdom on earth is resigned. The judgment, therefore, must be presumed to have taken place. After which begins Christ's eternal and glorious kingdom with his saints, which he is now "expecting." But the other—the developing and progressive kingdom here on earth—is more especially "the kingdom of heaven," "the kingdom of God," spoken of in Christ's parables and in the Gospels, the kingdom that John heralded, the kingdom that "came upon" the people with Christ's miracles, the kingdom that shall subdue and break in pieces all enemies and all the kingdoms of the earth. That Christ reigns now as King, see Matt. 21. 51, comp. Zech. 9. 9-10, "Thy King cometh unto thee meek," &c.,—"and his dominion shall be from sea to sea," &c., see also John 18. 37,—kingdom of "the truth," Matt. 16. 28,—"some here that shall not taste of death till," &c.; also 22. 44; 28. 18; Acts 1. 6–9; 2. 31–36; 3. 19–21; 5. 31–32; Eph, 1. 20–23; Heb. 10. 12-13.

That the resurrection and the judgment are closely connected, see John 5. 26–29, and 6. 39,40, 44,—"raise him up at the last day;" also Matt. 24. 29–51, and 25. 1–46,—showing that the judgment is immediately connected with the *παρουσία* and the end of the world, that it is of all men, good and bad, that the disciples themselves were interested parties in this judgment, and that its issues should be in eternal life and eternal punishment. And, further, to show that the time is the same for the just and the unjust, see also the decisive statements of 1 Thess. 4. 13–18 and 5. 1–11; 2 Thess. 1. 5–10; and 2. 1–8.

In particular, that the *παρουσία* and the *ἐπιφάνεια* refer to the same event, chronologically considered, is incontestably proved by such passages as 2 Thess. 2. 1–8; and by comparing the *ἐπιφάνεια* of 1 Tim. 6. 14, 15; 2 Tim. 4. 1, 8; Tit. 2. 13, with the *παρουσία* of Matt. 24. 3. 27 (30 *φανήσεται*), 37.39; 1 Cor. 15. 23; 1 Thess. 2. 19; 3. 13; 4. 15; James 5. 7, 8; 2 Pet. 1, 16; 3. 4, 12;

1 John 2. 28. It may be observed that *φανερόω* is referred alike to the *παρουσία* and the *ἐπιφάνεια*; 1 John 2. 28 and 3. 2, to the *παρουσία*; Col. 3. 4; 1 Pet. 5. 4; Rev. 15. 4, to the *ἐπιφάνεια*; 2 Tim. 1. 10, to a past *ἐπιφάνεια*. Also in Tit. 2. 11 and 3. 4, *ἐπιφαίνω* appears referring to the past; and *ἐπιφάνης* is found in Acts 2. 20; in Heb. 9. 27, 28 *ὀφθήσεται* is used.

"The last day" (John 6. 39, 40, 44; 11. 24), "the day of the Lord," "of the Lord Jesus," and of "Christ" (1 Cor. 1. 7–8—*ἀποκάλυψις*: 5. 5; Acts 2. 20; 3. 21; 2 Cor. 1. 14; Phil. 1. 6, 10; 2. 16; 1 Thess. 5. 2–4; 2 Thess. 2. 2; 2 Pet. 3. 10); "the day of God," (2 Pet. 3. 12); "the day of judgment" (1 John 4. 17; 2 Pet. 3. 7; 2. 9); "that day" (2 Tim. 1. 12; 2 Thess. 1. 7, 8, 9, 10; 1 Thess. 5. 4); "the day" (1 Cor. 3. 13–16); "the day of wrath" (Rom. 2. 5–16); "the judgment of the great day" (Jude 6; Rev. 20. 12–15);—all unquestionably refer to the same event or time.

Rev. 20. 4–6 is a difficult text; but it stands alone, and must not be so interpreted as to control and even contradict all the rest of the Scriptures. It was perverted to the support of the heretical Chiliasm of the first centuries, and this should be a warning to us not to subject it to a similar abuse. But, standing alone, it gives no sure ground for presuming that the millennial reign of the *martyrs*, after their ("the first") resurrection, will be here on this natural earth. "They reigned with Christ." It may be a spiritual and invisible reign in heavenly places,—it was their "souls" that were seen,—and, whatever it means, it may be already past, or yet to come. It is clear that the general resurrection of the dead and the final judgment come *after* this; and after that still the new heavens and the new earth, with the new Jerusalem:—Rev. 20. 12–15, and 21. 1–27; also 2 Pet. 3. 12–14. And observe here again, how in this day of judgment the saints and the wicked are alike interested—"the dead," *i.e.*, *all the dead*, "small and great, stand before God." "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ" (2 Cor. 5. 10). "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of God—and every one of us shall give account of himself to God" (Rom. 14. 10–12).

Whatever may be the meaning of the "first resurrec-

tion," our Burial Service plainly assumes, in consonance with the constant teaching of Christ and his Apostles—as in John 5. 28–29, and 1 Cor. 15, 22–23,—that *all* the faithful in Christ will be raised at the general resurrection at his second coming at the last day; and in the phrase, "the earth and the sea shall give up their dead," that Service plainly alludes to Rev. 20. 13, thus interpreting that passage as referring to the resurrection and judgment of all, both *the just* and the unjust,—a resurrection and judgment which are subsequent to "the millennial reign."

If "the first resurrection" is conceived of as a resurrection of the Saints from the dead in their *natural mortal* bodies; then they will die again; and how can it be so great a "*blessedness*" for them to be thus called back from Paradise to this earthly mortal state? How many, or who, will thus be raised? All the Saints or only a select portion? Or, if all, up to what time? And will they again marry and be given in marriage? Or how will they, being in their natural bodies, reign with Christ in his spiritual body? etc., etc.

But if they are raised in their *spiritual* bodies; then again, who, and how many, and up to what time? And how is this to be reconciled with the general resurrection of just and unjust at the last day? And how will they consort with the Saints who may be alive in their mortal bodies? What sort of society and civil life will this be? Will any of those who are thus alive die during the thousand years? or will they, too, be "changed"? If so, what will be done with new converts? And if not, will they continue to marry and be given in marriage? How will the status of the rising generations be determined? How much of this temporal natural earth will these natural and *spiritual* Saints occupy? What will take place with the rest of mankind occupying the remainder? Will none of them be converted by this society of Saints while Satan is bound? When he is let loose again they seem to be in great numbers and in a very anti-Christian state (Rev. 20. 7–9). Such and more questions innumerable might be asked, tending to expose the gross incongruities and utter inconceivableness of this millenarian theory.

The restoration of the Jews to Palestine is not expressly connected with the millennial reign, whatever

that reign may be; and, therefore, that question need not be discussed here, further than simply to give the conclusioms. These are, that the predictions of the restoration of the Jews, so far as they are to be understood literally, have been already fulfilled in the return from the captivity; that, for the rest, Christ now sits on the throne of David, his Church is the Mount Zion, his people are the true Israel of God—God's peculiar people and chosen nation; that the Jews ceased, in the temporal relation, to be the chosen people, after the crucifixion of Christ; and that their true restoration, their restoration in the highest, the Divine sense—the only sense compatible with the glowing rapture and grand imagery of the prophetic symbols—will be their embracing of the Messiah, their conversion to Christianity. They may be restored to Palestine, or they may not; that is a question of human probabilities. But if they are so restored it will not be the proper fulfillment of the Scripture prophecies.

THE RESURRECTION.

How spirits exist without bodies we cannot tell. Of course it is unimaginable. Yet that they do so exist is certain; as in the case of our Lord in the interval between his death and resurrection. We are not to suppose that the thief had his body in Paradise any more than Christ; and it is certain Christ had not his. As to any sort of envelope or enclosing matter, presumed by some to be absolutely necessary to the existence of finite spirit, it is a mere philosophical speculation, with which we have nothing to do; and, in any event, we shall need such an envelope after death no more than Christ did. Those who think it exists seem to make it something which belongs to the very constitution of our spirits and accompanies them while in the body as well as when out of it; and if so, its retention could scarcely be a resurrection. But this supposed necessity for it arises, in fact, from the prevalence of materialistic ideas, and from the fact that many persons have a very imperfect notion of spirit, or no notion at all. To them spirit is utterly insubstantial; without matter it is simply nothing.

But, though human disembodied spirits exist in active consciousness in the intermediate state, yet embodiment is essential to the perfect constitution of humanity, to the full play of man's faculties, and to his complete development and happiness. "The redemption of the body" is the fulfillment of his "adoption" and sonship; the resurrection is the culmination of his hopes; he longs not to be unclothed but clothed upon. Thus and thus only is the biblical and Christian idea of immortality realized in its completeness.

The abstract, gloomy and shadowy immortality of heathen mythology and philosophy stands in deep contrast with the glorious resurrection-immortality of Christianity. Even the wisest and best of the heathen would have preferred to continue in this life, if possible; rather than go to the life of the shades, though it had been to be in Elysium with the gods.

Christian immortality is always associated with the

resurrection of the body ; according to the Scripture, each involves the other. See Matt. 22. 29–32 ; 1 Cor. 15. 12–19 ; Heb. 11. 35, (cf. 2 Mac. 7. 9, 11, 14, 20–23).

Immortality is established by Christianity as a *fact* rather than as a mere doctrine or theory. Christ's resurrection is at once its illustration and its pledge. 1 Cor. 15. 12–23 ; Phil. 3. 21 ; 1 Thess. 4. 14 ; &c.

But what is the resurrection? It is (1) a resurrection of *the body*. It was Christ's *body* that was raised ; and his resurrection is the constant *analogon* of ours. See Matt. 27. 52, 53 ; Phil. 3. 21 ; 1 Cor. 15. 23, 37–54 ; John 5. 28, 29 ; 11. 23, 24, and Rom. 8. 23.

It has often been objected that the Scriptures speak of "the resurrection from the dead," but nowhere of the resurrection of the *body*. But to how little purpose this objection is made is manifest from the fact that, in like manner, the Scriptures nowhere speak of the resurrection of Christ's body;—their phrase is, "he rose from the dead,"—and yet it is abundantly evident that it was his *body* that rose. And that the rising of the body was no strange idea appears from the statement that "many bodies of saints which slept arose and came out of their graves *after* his resurrection." Christ was "the first fruits" of them that slept. He was the first who ever rose in an incorruptible, immortal body ;—in this, being unlike Lazarus, the widow's son at Nain, or any other ; they rose in corruptible, mortal bodies, and undoubtedly died again. But he being raised from the dead dieth no more. True, even in the tomb, our Lord's body saw no corruption ; and in that, it was unlike the bodies of departed saints at the final resurrection ; but equally unlike will be the bodies of those who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord. Yet the Apostle is not stumbled at these. They will, says he, have no advantage over them that sleep, for the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and these shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. Their corruptible bodies must put on incorruption ;—and so, doubtless did the body of our Lord, for "flesh and blood *cannot* inherit the kingdom of God." The Apostle also plainly says : "He shall transform our base body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body according to the energy whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." This must apply to the bodies of *all* the

saints, whether they die or not before the final resurrection. And observe it is their *bodies*—and not simply they themselves,—and that their bodies are not *exchanged* for others, but changed, refashioned, *metaschematized*, into a new and glorious form and constitution, like the body of their blessed Lord. "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

It is (2) a *future* and *general* resurrection, at the last day. John 5. 28, 29; 6. 39, 44, 54; 11. 24; 1 Thess. 4. 16; 1 Cor. 15. 51–55.

These utterances of Scripture are direct and explicit to all the points, that the resurrection is a future resurrection, a general resurrection of all at one and the same time, and that at Christ's coming at the last great day. If we leave out of account what is mysteriously called "the first resurrection," and the case of those whose graves were opened at Christ's crucifixion, there is no resurrection of the dead *after* that of Christ *until his coming*, until his glorious appearing,—when "he shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God." These grand words are doubtless figurative; but they are quite too grand to be applied in endless repetition to the case of each individual saint as he passes into the unseen world. They describe one great event. "Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." This coming is plainly his second and final advent. Then all the saints which sleep will be raised, and, with those who shall be alive, will be gathered together unto him. And not only this, but the wicked also will be raised, as appears from 2 Thess. 1. 7–10.

Yet some have supposed that the resurrection of each person takes place immediately after his death. But if we seek for the biblical and not a merely speculative doctrine of the resurrection, we may boldly say that this is impossible. It cannot be reconciled with the texts just named, or with the general drift of the New Testament. Perhaps 2 Cor. 5. 1–4 may be cited in its support. But this must be interpreted in conformity with the express, distinct, formal, and argumentative statements of 1 Cor. 15—which is the classical text upon the subject,—and with the rest of the instruction of Christ and his Apostles; instead of our seeking to conform

all the rest of Scripture to this single passage. And this is easily done; for, "our house which is from heaven" need not imply that our future spiritual bodies will be given to us at once, at the moment of death, or that they will descend ready-made out of the sky, instead of being raised from the grave; but that their resurrection will have a heavenly origin, a heavenly cause, from the life-giving power of Christ, and that thus they will be in the likeness of his glorious body,—"the image of the heavenly."

It is (3) a resurrection of this *identical* body. Phil. 3. 21; 1 Cor. 15. 42–44, 53, 54; John 5. 28, 29.

Christ's body raised was the same that was interred. Our resurrection is to be in the likeness of his, and by his the Apostle proves it. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." That which is raised is the same that was sown; and what was sown was the *body*. And the Apostle says plainly, "*this corruptible* must put on incorruption," and that because "flesh and blood," that is the natural body unchanged, "cannot inherit the kingdom of God." How great a change this body will undergo in constitution and form and character, we may not say; but through all the refashioning it will remain the same body, it will not be exchanged for another.

It is (4) its resurrection as a *spiritual body*. Also the bodies of those who are then alive will be *changed* to spiritual bodies. They will none of them have to die and then be raised. Now the spiritual body is simply a body adapted to the use of the spirit in a spiritual state, just as the natural or *psychical*, or soul-body, is a body adapted to the use of the soul in its present physical state. But as the former does not consist of soul-substance, no more will the latter be constituted of spirit-substance; that would be to assign to each person after the resurrection *two* spirits, one which he had before, and one which he then receives. The spiritual body is still *body*—real, material body. It must still come under the definition of body. The adjective does not annul or sublimate the substantive. "Christ took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the

perfection of man's nature; *wherewith he ascended into heaven and there sitteth.*" Art. iv.

It has been objected, (1) There will not be room or material enough for all the bodies to be raised. A little mathematics would relieve us of this objection, *even if* we knew how much room and material would be required for each body.

(2.) A material organization cannot be made incorruptible. We may simply ask the objector how he knows? This objection is just the counterpart of that which cannot conceive of spirit at all without some material basis or envelope.

(3.) The matter of one body may have entered into the constitution of another, and so belong to both at the moment of their death.

But the objector must not insist upon too absolute an identity. We are accustomed to speak of bodies as "the same;" and yet perfect identity is not predicable of bodies at all; they are in a constant flux; and it is unreasonable to require a stricter identity between the natural and the spiritual bodies than between natural bodies themselves. We call our bodies the same from infancy to old-age; and yet they undergo great changes of form and many entire changes of material. They are ours every day while we live and do not first become our own just as we part with them at death; and if the resurrection body were the restoration of that of any period of our lives, it would be our identical body.

But in fact, according to the teaching and illustrations of the Apostle, it is not necessary to the identity of the resurrection body that it should properly have either the same form or the same particles of matter with the present body;—though we may suppose it to retain the *inherent power* of resuming at pleasure, and as its own, all the forms belonging to that body in its antecedent history. To preserve the identity of the natural and the spiritual bodies it is simply necessary that there should be some *organic connection* between them. Now the identity of organized bodies consists in the continuance of the same organizing germ or principle. This original organizing germ or principle being preserved, and restored to the disembodied spirit at the resurrection, may then be developed into whatever glorious form may seem good to infinite wisdom.

We add (1) In regard to the recognition of friends in the future life, it may be questioned whether there is any such recognition in the intermediate state,—*that* is to be "with the Lord;" but, compare Luke 16. 23, &c. There certainly will be such a recognition after the resurrection; see 1 Thess. 4. 13, 14, 18. Hence the "comfort."

(2.) There will be a resurrection of the unjust as well as of the just;—"Some to shame and everlasting contempt," Dan. 12. 2; "to the resurrection of damnation," John 5. 29. But it is the resurrection of the just,—"the blessed hope,"—that is mostly dwelt upon in the New Testament, as in 1 Cor. 15.

(3.) The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is a *revealed* doctrine, to be proved only from Scripture; but it may be confirmed or illustrated by many striking analogies in nature.

THE JUDGMENT OF THE LAST DAY.

There is a judgment going on in this life; but that here meant is a judgment *after* death. "It is appointed unto men once to die, and *after* this the judgment." Heb. 9. 27.

This Judgment does not begin for each man immediately after death, but it is at the final coming of Christ and after the resurrection—a general judgment of all mankind at the last great day, a judgment not "of nations" as such, but of all individual men; see Matt. 25. Here, as in multitudes of other cases, "all nations" simply means all mankind. It is abundantly plain from the text that it is not nations but persons, individual men, that receive the sentence of eternal life or of eternal punishment. It is express that good and bad are both then to receive their meed or their doom. See also Rom. 14. 12; 2 Cor. 5. 10; Rev. 20. 12.

The *date* of this Judgment, the day and the hour no man can tell. As to the length of time it will occupy we are equally ignorant. Some have been driven by their general theories to suggest that it will be an *æon*, a dispensation, an indefinite cyclic period. It certainly *may* be longer than a natural day; but from the nature of the case and from the whole air of the Scripture representations, it would seem that it must exclude all other business for those engaged in it, and preclude all changes of character while it lasts; it will be *one great day*—the *crisis* of man's destiny. Such has been the constant interpretation and faith of the Church in all ages.

As to the place of the Judgment, some of the Fathers thought it would be in the Valley of Jehoshaphat (Joel 3. 2, 12). Others have imagined it in the aerial spaces near the earth. But all these are but idle speculations. God will provide a place for his judgment.

God, too, will be the Judge, in the Person of the God-man. None but the Omniscient can be the absolute Judge of all. But all authority to execute judgment is committed to the Son of Man. As to the saying of our Lord to his apostles, that "in the regeneration, when the Son of Man should sit upon the throne of his glory, they also should sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel;" and the saying of St. Paul, that "the saints shall judge the world, and shall judge angels;" commentators have been greatly puzzled to find their meaning, and a great variety of interpretations have been given. Among these it has been suggested that the saints, and particularly the Apostles, may accompany the Lord as assessors or assistant judges. But even though something like this might perhaps be meant, is it not an attempt to visualize the details of the judgment scene somewhat incongruously, and, at all events, more definitely than we are authorized to do? Meanwhile one thing is clear: we are not at liberty so to interpret these dark sayings as to contradict the plain facts, that Jesus Christ is the sole Judge of quick and dead and that "*we must all* appear before his judgment seat, that every one may receive the things done *in the body*, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad;" for "*every one of us* shall give account of himself to God."

At 1 Thess. 3. 13, we read of "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his Saints." May this mean that the Lord will bring with Him (the Spirits of) the Saints from Paradise, to be united with their resurrection-bodies at his coming? Compare 1 Thess. 4. 14. Or, does it rather mean that he will come "and all the *holy* angels with him"? Matt. 25. 31; and compare 2 Thess. 1. 7; Jude 14. It certainly does not mean that all the departed Saints will come to be judges *instead of* being raised from the dead and appearing themselves before the judgment-seat to be judged.

This Judgment is final and irreversible—an "eternal judgment;" and it means the determination of each man's future destiny of reward or punishment, according to his character in relation to Christ; see Matt. 25. 35–45. According to the statement here made, the relation to Christ, the posture of the heart and the bearing of the actions towards him, will be the ultimate and

fundamental test of character. "Inasmuch as ye have done it, or have not done it, unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it, or ye have not done it, unto me," says the Judge; as he had before said: "Whosoever shall give unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in *the name of a disciple*," —"whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink *in my name, because ye belong to Christ*, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward." It can hardly be supposed that Christ regarded those whom he dismissed with a curse "into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels," as being included among those whom he called "these my brethren;" and yet we may not doubt that deeds of kindness done to *any man*, whether he belong to Christ or not, especially efforts for his spiritual good, if prompted by the love of Christ, and done in his spirit—done as to those for whom Christ died,—will be accepted in his sight. The touchstone, the criterion, is found in *the reference* to *him*.

The Judgment is not for God's information, but, we may presume, for a manifestation of character in and to his creatures. The justice and the mercy of his sentence will be brought home to every man's conscience, and will be shown and declared to all the world, to angels and to men, unto the honor and glory of God. But, without waiting for the Judgment, God will know how to treat every man according to his deserts after death, in the intermediate state, as well as before death, in this world.

The judgment *according to works* does not conflict with "justification by faith only," for faith is the very principle of all good works in the Christian sense, and the faith that justifies is itself justified, proved, by works. Works are always the proper *evidence;* and evidence is precisely what a judgment calls for. Neither does the general final Judgment conflict with the *present* justification of believers or with the *present* condemnation of those who believe not. For, as believers are already justified, so are unbelievers already condemned; and the present justification of the former no more precludes their being judged at the last day, than does the present condemnation of the latter. The Judgment, as we have said, is, not for an ascertainment, but for a general manifestation of character; and, perhaps we may suppose also, for

the determination of the *degree* of happiness or misery assigned to each individual, whether of those who are saved or of those who are lost.

The scenic descriptions given of the last Judgment may be, and probably are, in their details figurative. But under any rational and candid exegesis, there still remain the solid facts of a future, general and final Judgment, both of the just and of the unjust, and the consequent retribution. Without the retribution the judgment would have neither weight nor meaning. It would be an idle ceremony, a mere farce, a *brutum fulmen*. The creeds, therefore, in confessing the final Judgment, must be presumed to confess such a judgment as is taught in Holy Scripture,—a judgment followed by an eternal retribution.

PROBATION AFTER DEATH.

That the present life is the special season of probation has been the doctrine commonly received by all who have believed in a future retribution, whether they were Christians or heathen. It is the natural instinct of mankind; and it is accordingly treated by Bishop Butler as a doctrine of *Natural Religion*. In the Sacred Scriptures, therefore, it is mostly taken for granted; and, if it is not carefully and formally or frequently asserted, it is because nobody denied or doubted it. It is always implied in the Scriptures, and is never contradicted.

As having a special and decisive bearing upon this subject, the general drift of our Lord's Parables is to be particularly noted; for example, that of the wheat and the tares, of the net, of the husbandmen, of the talents, &c. See also Matt. 25.

In 2 Cor. 5. 10, the final judgment is expressly declared to be according to "the things done *in the body*." It will have no reference, therefore, to any probation or purgatory in the disembodied state. In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, also, we learn that, in the intermediate state, there is "a great gulf fixed" between the righteous and the wicked, over which neither can pass to the other. And in Heb. 9. 27, we read "after death the judgment." There will be no transitions in the meantime.

The true interpretation of the passage in 1 Pet. 3. 18–20 has been much disputed. But the chief even of those who interpret it of Christ's preaching to the spirits of the antediluvians during the interval between his death and resurrection, do not represent that preaching as offering to them a further probation, but as announcing, to those who had repented of their disobedience before their death, the comforting news of the accomplished redemption. But it is far from certain that the passage must be interpreted of Christ's preaching in the intermediate state at all. In the first place the ζωοποιηθείς (rendered "being quickened") properly means "made

alive," not "kept alive," but "made alive from being dead;" and must refer, therefore, not to the intermediate state of continued life, but to the *resurrection*, of Christ; see John 5. 21; Rom. 4. 17; 8. 11; 1 Cor. 15. 22; Test. xii patr. *Τοὺς νεκροὺς ζωοποιῆσαι*; and the Nicene Creed, of the Holy Ghost, *Τὸ ζωοποιόν* "the Giver of life." And in the second place, we read in Genesis that, "when the long-suffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah," God said: "My *Spirit* shall not *always* strive with man, yet he shall have a respite of one hundred and twenty years." The Spirit, then, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, did continue to strive with men a hundred and twenty years through "Noah, a preacher of righteousness;" and during that interval many may have repented, and died even before the flood came. The most likely meaning of the whole passage, therefore, would seem to be something like this: "Christ also suffered once for all for the sins (of all men from the beginning), the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us (all) to God, being put to death in (the weakness of) the flesh, but raised to life in (the power of) the Spirit; in which same Spirit also he (once) went and preached to the Spirits (now) in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God was waiting in the days of Noah," &c. So that the preaching was by Christ's Spirit through the mouth of Noah. See also Pearson on the Creed, Acts 2 and 5; and Augustine there referred to by him.

After the *judgment* there is no probation; for that is final and irreversible,—an "eternal judgment." After that, the record runs: "He that is unjust let him do unrighteousness yet more, and he that is filthy let him become filthy yet more; and he that is righteous let him do righteousness yet more, and he that is holy let him be made holy yet more," Rev. 22. 11. In 2 Pet. 3. 9, also, will be found conclusive proof that there is no probation after the last judgment; for, if men might come to repentance and so be saved, after "the day of the Lord" as well as before, the Apostle's words would become utterly unmeaning. That day, says he, is in mercy delayed, "because the Lord is long-suffering toward mankind, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

The transition out of this world into the intermediate

state may be perfectly *natural* in its moral aspect; and so also from that into the state after the judgment. But it does not follow from this that probation will continue, or that all the moral conditions will remain unchanged. Natural transitions are perfectly compatible with great and sudden changes of relations, as may be seen by analogy to the case of *birth*. The child's organic dependence upon the parent at once ceases, and he forthwith begins to depend entirely upon his own heart and lungs for the circulation and aeration of his blood, and upon his own stomach for the digestion of the sustenance which he now receives only through his own mouth. In short, there is an immense internal revolution; former organic arrangements are broken off, and new organic agencies are set in motion. The residence in the womb, moreover, is the special period for the *formative* process of the bodily structure. If any of its parts are wanting at birth, or are ill or unevenly developed, or abnormally marked, it may not be possible to remedy the defect afterwards.

There is a sense, however, in which it is to be fully admitted that all men, the saved and the lost, will be forever *free* to sin or to love and obey God; that is to say, in any sense in which such freedom may be a necessary condition of *moral action and character;* for that action and character will doubtless continue throughout eternity. But this does not hinder that it should be quite as *certain* that neither party will turn from their assigned and chosen condition, as it now is that no fallen and sinful man will of himself turn to God.

All men will have had a *fair*, though, perhaps, not an *equal* opportunity. Each will be judged according to the opportunity he has had. *None will or can be condemned but for his own sins.* If you suppose a man's lack of opportunity to be such as to free him from all sin, nobody can suppose, or ever did suppose, that he will be punished; but if not, if he has really sinned, what is the hardship, what is the horribleness, of his being punished for his sins? If any heathen or other man can stand up in the judgment before God and truly say: "I am conscious of no sin, I have ever lived up fully to my light and opportunities and abilities, I have fulfilled throughout the conditions of my probation such as it was;"—that man will

not be condemned, he cannot be punished. And if so, men need not trouble themselves so much about the outrageous injustice and unmercifulness of condemning the "poor ignorant heathen, who never heard of Christ," but whom an Apostle nevertheless declares to be "without excuse." Rom. 1. 20. God's ways are equal. To whom little is given, of him little will be required, and conversely. "He that knew his lord's will and did it not shall be beaten with many stripes; and he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with *few* stripes." Observe it is not said, "he shall not be beaten at all." Our Lord always represents that men will be dealt with at the last according to the probation they have enjoyed; and he plainly assumes that some men will have greater advantages in their probation than others. But he as plainly assumes also that all men are by nature accountable beings; that all have light enough to be capable of sinning and consequently of incurring punishment. Meantime we may be sure of this: *if* any have not sinned, neither will they be punished. None will be punished eternally, or condemned at all, *for never having heard of Christ;* any more than Tyre and Sidon or Sodom and Gomorrah were condemned for not having seen his miracles. Every man will be condemned *only* for his own conscious sin or sinfulness.

I have no doubt that many of the heathen will be saved;—no man knows how many, not to speak of the great number dying in infancy. The story of the Ninevites may read us a lesson on this subject, Jonah 3. 10 and 4. 11. Still, two things are plain: (1) Whoever is saved will be saved not for his ignorance or for his own sinlessness or for his living up to the light he had, but only in Jesus Christ and through the grace of the Holy Spirit; and (2) These who enjoy the light of the Gospel have greater advantages and better opportunities than the unenlightened heathen *in reference to the attainment of everlasting salvation.*

If, in the justice and mercy of God, all are to have an equal probation as a matter of course, and none can possibly have a more favorable opportunity of attaining salvation than any other, why should we send the Gospel to the heathen? Is it simply and solely as a means of promoting their civilization and moral improvement, their

temporal welfare or happiness? Is that the teaching of Christ and His Apostles? Indeed, according to this doctrine of equality, if we can do anything for any towards increasing their means and opportunities of obtaining salvation, it would be our best and wisest course to *concentrate* all our efforts within a *very narrow* sphere; for, whatever benefits or advantages we might thus procure for those within that sphere would infallibly and of necessity, according to the premises, redound to the equal benefit of all mankind, without further ado on our part, and whether we will or not. God's *justice* in this matter is easily vindicated. We can see that the Judge of all the earth doeth right. But if we take upon ourselves to go further, and make our lawless and limitless demands on His *infinite love*, presuming to determine *à priori*, and without any express promise or assurance, what that love must necessarily bestow, are we not venturing quite beyond our depth?*

That the probation need not, in every case, be the fullest possible or conceivable, or in every case equal to any other, seems to be implied in such passages as Matt. 11. 20–24; Luke 10. 12–14. From these words of our Lord it would seem that, though God knew that if the Sidonians, Tyrians and Sodomites had had the mighty works done among them which were done in the cities of Galilee, "they would have repented long ago sitting in sackcloth and ashes," yet he had not vouchsafed to them the privilege of seeing what would thus have secured their repentance; but rather gave the privilege to those who abused it; and all this in mysterious connexion with the *Divine omniscience*. Indeed, if, before the judgment, the absolutely fullest possible probation were required in every case,—or in any case,—that judgment might have to be indefinitely postponed. Still, as was said above, *free moral action*, but not probation, may, and indeed must, be continued forever.

*See Soteriology, ii (Introductory), where the subject is treated at large.

ETERNAL RETRIBUTION.

Statement of the Doctrine:

"These shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life." Matt. 25. 46. Such is the award revealed to us in the words of the gracious and merciful Saviour, who is himself to be the Judge. Such is the simple and definitive sentence of the final Doom.

Let us first consider what is meant by

ETERNAL LIFE.

The Scriptural expressions "Life," "Eternal Life," like the phrases, "the Kingdom of God," "the Kingdom of Heaven," have, in the common mind been almost, if not quite, exclusively confined for their realization to the heavenly state. By way of reaction from this vulgar apprehension, some have been led to restrict their proper application to the experience of the present life. For these *the Church* exhausts the idea of the Kingdom of Heaven; and "the life," even "the eternal life," expresses properly and only that spiritual life in Christ which the true members of that Church here enjoy. When tested by the language and mind of the Scripture, both sides seem almost equally in error. In many instances of Scripture usage, "the kingdom," "the kingdom of heaven," or "the kingdom of God" may mean *primarily* the Christian Church; as in Luke 17. 21, "the kingdom of God is within you." And so in Matt. 3. 2; 5. 19-20; 7. 21; 11. 11-12; 16. 19; 21. 31; Mark 4. 26; Luke 10. 9, 11; John 18. 36; Acts 1. 3; Rom. 14. 17; and generally in our Lord's parables. But after all, in their original and proper sense, and in a more general usage, the phrases seem plainly to refer to the state of heavenly glory and blessedness; as in this sentence of our Lord: "Inherit the kingdom

prepared for you." So Luke 23. 42, "When thou comest into thy kingdom;" 1 Cor. 15. 50, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" Eph. 5. 5, "Hath any inheritance in the Kingdom of Christ and of God;" so also 1 Cor. 6. 9–10; Gal. 5. 21; 2 Tim. 4. 18; James 2. 5; 2 Pet. 1. 11. Indeed, it is abundantly evident that this "Kingdom" includes more than the Church on earth, more than belongs to the experience of this present world,—includes the heavenly state, and has there its proper and complete fulfillment.

In like manner not only the term "the life," but even the phrase "eternal life," is frequently applied to what exists and is experienced in this world (John 5. 24, and 6. 47, 54), "hath eternal life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life;" so, also, John 17. 3; Rom. 8. 6; Eph. 4. 18; Col. 3. 3; 1 John 3. 14, 15; 5. 11, 12, 13. But again, the phrase "eternal life," in its proper, original sense, refers to the future life of unending heavenly blessedness. In this sentence of our Lord, "but the righteous (shall go) into eternal life" it is plain that such must be its purport; so, also, at Mark 10. 30, and Luke 18. 30, "and in the world to come, eternal life;" John 3. 15, 16, "not perish, but have eternal life;" 6. 27, and 12. 25, "endureth —shall keep it—unto eternal life;" Rom. 2. 7, "to them that seek immortality, eternal life, in the day when God shall judge," etc.; 5. 17; Gal. 6. 8; 1 Tim. 6. 12, 19; Tit. 1. 2, and 3. 7. The truth is, it is difficult to see how any intelligent reader of the New Testament should fail to perceive that "the life," "eternal life," is more than Christian calling or Christian living, or spiritual renovation or resurrection, as experienced here;—that it includes eternal blessedness in the world to come, the "life everlasting" of the Apostles' Creed; or, as the Nicene Creed phrases it, "the life of the world to come;" or, as St. Chrysostom says, in his prayer, "in the world to come, life everlasting." Indeed, the distinction between "eternal" and "everlasting," which some have so earnestly endeavored to draw,—were it not that they are men of so great learning and reputation,—one would be tempted to pronounce simply puerile. The same distinction will hold just as well between *everlasting* and *everlasting*. And as for rendering "*æonian*" for *eternal*, we might as well put the whole Greek Testament into Roman letters

for English readers, in order to escape all misinterpretation in translating. For I believe all linguists and lexicographers have agreed in assigning to αἰώνιος the meaning of eternal or everlasting.

But what is this "eternal life?" It has an essence, and that essence has a duration. It is something, and that something lasts forever. "The eternal life" is the same as the "life;" and yet "eternal" adds something to the idea; and that something must primarily refer to duration. The life is spiritual life, but it does not follow that "eternal" means "spiritual." The life which is spiritual is also eternal, and the life which is eternal is also spiritual; but it is not called eternal because it is spiritual,—that would be an idle reduplication,—but because it *is* eternal, because it endures forever. Just as we say, Jesus Christ is God. Not that he is God *as* Jesus Christ, or because he was called Jesus Christ, but that he who was Jesus Christ, he who was historically born at Bethlehem, and was anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power,—that same person is the eternal God. We might as well say that the name Jesus Christ *means* God, as to say that the term eternal *means* spiritual, or is merely qualificative and has no reference to duration. "Eternal life" may be used as a technical expression for the spiritual life here, but it is because this spiritual life is the same which is to continue hereafter forever. In short, as the "kingdom of heaven" on earth is the beginning and the preparation of the "kingdom of heaven" in the heavenly places, so is the "eternal life" in this world the beginning and the preparation of the "eternal life" in the eternal world. The cases are perfectly parallel. And it may be added, that these are not two kingdoms nor two lives, but two aspects or states of the same kingdom and the same life.

This spiritual and eternal life is derived from Christ, and is imparted to the soul by the power of the Holy Ghost, "the Giver of life." It dates neither from our natural birth nor from our natural death, but from the moment of the new-birth unto righteousness. This life we have in Christ, and in him alone. For "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." He was made man, that through the light of his gospel the life might be imparted to men. It is imparted to all "that believe in his name; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

It is not the incarnation of the Son of God, as a physical fact, as his historical assumption of human nature, that, by any sort of solidarity of humanity, or of physical contact or communication or propagation, or priestly touch or manipulation, or holy water, or holy wafer, or any holy rite or sacramental magic or materialism,—infuses this life into all mankind or into any man. This life is, in its very essence, a spiritual life, a moral life ; is bestowed by moral means and spiritual agencies, and is received in our spirits, in our souls, in our hearts, by faith. The life that we live in the flesh we live by the faith of the Son of God ; and in the consciousness of that faith, the Apostle could say, "I live—yet—not I, but Christ liveth in me." And when he who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory. For this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.

This spiritual life, then, is begun in this world and is continued and perfected in eternal blessedness in the world to come. To no other life than this spiritual life is the phrase "eternal life" ever applied in the New Testament. It never means merely physical life, whether corporeal, intellectual or moral. It never means mere unending conscious existence. It is never predicated of the wicked and the lost ; but is directly contrasted with their eternal punishment. This life is expected in Heaven. It is the end of the Christian hope, which is "laid up for us in heaven." It is the culmination of the Divine promises. It is the reigning with Christ in his eternal and glorious kingdom ; the "knowing" and "seeing" of God forever (John 17. 3 ; Matt. 5. 8 ; 1 John 3. 2) ; the everlasting bliss of heaven.

In its essence the spiritual and eternal life is *holiness and love*, but its inseparable adjunct or consequence is *happiness*,—the happiness of holiness, the unutterable joy of love. Both elements exist here, and both will exist in vastly higher degrees hereafter,—here hidden, there revealed. But, in the heavenly state, the latter is presented as the glorious *reward*, when, freed from all the clogs and burdens, the "groanings" and sorrows of earth, from all the trials and temptations, the enticements, deceits, and persecutions of the world, the flesh

and the devil, the ransomed soul shall exult in unspeakable joy, while it takes up the song of Moses and the Lamb. Its holy activities shall have unfettered movement and boundless scope, and divine love shall expand into endless and inconceivable bliss, in the glorious presence and communion of its God and Saviour. And thus it is that eternal life comes especially to mean eternal heavenly blessedness.

The descriptions given in the Scriptures of the scenes and employments of the heavenly state are for the most part figurative. Indeed, how could it be otherwise in endeavoring to present to our minds what eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived? Yet the experiences of that state may not be, in kind, so unlike those of the present as we are apt to think. We shall be the same moral and spiritual beings there that we are here; and the laws of our mental constitution will remain unchanged. But in all the representations which the Scriptures give of the happiness and employments of the heavenly state, one thing is remarkable: they refer scarcely at all to intellectual activity and expansion and enjoyment, to artistic development, to growth or gratification in scientific or philosophical knowledge or speculation;—on which some modern Christians are disposed so much to dwell as constituents of heavenly blessedness;—but they set forth, under the forms of holy and happy worship, the ineffable joy of that personal communion of holy love which the saints will have with their Saviour and their God. And this is, in truth, the highest ideal of man's perfection and happiness. The saints may have their joyful errands of love and mercy throughout the realms of God's vast creation; and they may also have glorious intuitions into the mysteries of his works and ways, and into his grand designs and purposes; but after all, the centre of their contemplations, the goal of their hearts' affections, the object of their glowing and adoring love will be God himself; and blissful communion with him will be the sum of all their happiness.

This phantasy of an intellectual heaven is no more the Scriptural view than was that of the millennial state as pictured in the dreams of the ancient Chiliasts; who fancied in their sensual hearts that then each vine would have ten thousand branches, and each branch ten thousand twigs, and each twig ten thousand clusters of

grapes, and each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape, when expressed, would yield twenty-five measures of wine. And when any one of the saints should take hold of a cluster of grapes, another cluster would cry out: "I am better, take me, and praise the Lord." (Iren. adv. Haer. v. 33.) Thus each invents a heaven after his own taste;—*Sua cuique voluptas.* But God does not make his heaven to suit us, rather he would make us to suit his heaven. As for that other wretched and degrading travesty of the heavenly state set forth with apparent seriousness by some, in late years, which would furnish heaven with toys and playthings for children, and pianos and Jew's harps for those who fancy such instruments of music, and battledoors and chess-boards for those who are addicted to such sports and games; one can scarcely pause to speak of such things with patience;—as though infants and natural fools, artists and artisans, acrobats and bird fanciers were to continue in heaven, in their infancy, their idiotisms and specialties, without development or elevation, or the proper exercise of the religious affections!

But to return to the intellectual heaven; I doubt not there will be intellect in heaven;—expansion of intellect and enlargement of knowledge to an extent, and by methods and processes of which our poor, groveling terrestrial science, at its best estate, can give us but a faint conception,—if any conception at all. For "then shall we know even as also we are known;" and what sort of high and heavenly intuition that may be we must wait until we get to heaven before we can learn. I have no doubt that every activity of our being will then be a happy as well as a holy activity, for it will be interfused and energized by the all-pervading soul of love. There, as here, love must be superior to knowledge and to faith. Love must actuate and subordinate every other activity,—must thrill in every pulse of the life of heaven. All can love; love is suited to all classes and capacities of minds; love will be the great leveller of all minor distinctions and differences.

Intellect is high and noble; but it is not the highest and noblest thing. Satan may still possess a most gigantic intellect and have a range and extent of knowledge in comparison with which all our boasted science may be but the tyro's smattering; and yet he is not only

unutterably miserable but ineffably low, mean, degraded and contemptible. The humblest worshipper of God is infinitely higher as well as happier than he.

Persons are more than things,—more than all the relations of things,—more than all abstract truths,—more than all rational ideas. The sphere of the affections is higher than the sphere of the intellect, for its objects are *persons*. Love rightly directed is a nobler as well as a more blessed activity than knowledge. Heaven were no heaven if it were not a social state. The communion of the saints with one another there, and with the holy angels, and their communion with their God and Saviour, in exercises of holy love and acts of joyous service, will so elevate and fill and satisfy the soul as to leave small room, perchance, for such gratifications as might be afforded by what we call intellectual pleasures. God himself is not an abstraction or a mere idea, but a real living person, or rather *three persons* in a perfect unity of being;—as though even the divine blessedness could not consist with the bleak and absolute unity of conscious isolation, but has ever required the living joy of an ineffable personal communion.

The love of the heart, the worship, the adoration of the soul, naturally express themselves here in music and song, in the utterances of praise and prayer, in gestures and postures of devotion. They must assume some form, they demand expression in some way. But after all, the outward form of expression is not the main thing. *That* is the inward affection, the personal devotion, the worship of the heart. In heaven the love and the adoration must remain, only vastly higher, nobler and more absorbing; but the outward expression may be, doubtless will be, different, though we naturally continue to describe it under the forms familiar to us; and so we speak of the songs and alleluias of heaven. The happiness of that blessed place will consist, we may be sure, in the exercise and expression of holy love, of worship and adoration,—under whatever *forms* they may be manifested. The *personal* relation and communion will be the soul of heavenly bliss. God will be all and in all. But the Christian's self-annihilation and absorption in God is not the Buddhistic Nirvana, for it is the self-annihilation of love; and where there is love there must still be a person who loves as well as a person who

is loved. The blissful and harmonious action of all the faculties and energies in ceaseless progression, in ever-ready service, in entire consecration, all centering in God through the all-pervading spirit of love, may constitute the holy worship, the song and the psalm of the heavenly life, the music of the eternal world. The hymns and harps of heaven are confessedly figures of speech; but they have a real meaning, and they mean no less than worship,—holy, heavenly, happy, loving adoration. Gabriel finds his noblest employment, his highest and purest delight, in praising, in extolling and magnifying his Maker; and so do all the heavenly hosts of cherubim and seraphim that

> "with songs,
> And choral symphonies, day without night,
> Circle his throne rejoicing."

And so will all the redeemed from among men, who will fall down before him that sitteth on the throne, and worship him that liveth forever and ever, and cast their crowns before the throne, saying:

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honor and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created."

"Unto him that hath loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us a kingdom and priests to God and his Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever."

And ten thousands of times ten thousands, and thousands of thousands shall be heard, "saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honor and glory and blessing." Amen, and Amen.

ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

The "Eternal Life" of the just has been considered; about which there is little dispute except as to some matters of detail. It remains to consider the question of the "Eternal Punishment" of the wicked. Concerning this the contest is very earnest, often acrimonious, and not unfrequently misbefitting a subject so grave and tremendous.

1. According to the uniform teaching of the Scriptures, as already intimated, there are *only two* classes to receive the final sentence, and *only two* states of eternal retribution;—no intermediates, and no transitions. See the parables of Christ, and his account of the results of the general and final Judgment, in Matt. 25; also John 5. 28, 29; and the story of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke 16. 19–31. That the New Testament recognizes two classes at the final adjudication, the righteous and the wicked,—and no more; two Kingdoms, God's and Satan's,—and no more; two places of eternal retribution, heaven and hell,—and no more, is a fact so plainly on the face of the sacred text that it is scarcely denied in any quarter. But there are some who hold the doctrine itself to be utterly unreasonable, unnatural and absurd; merely "*traditional.*" Of these there are two classes: (1) Those who proceed *logically*, and consequently deny and reject the teaching of the New Testament as vulgar and false; and (2) those who scout at "logic" and "logicians" and with whom it is condemnation enough of any doctrine that it seeks to maintain a *logical coherence* with itself, with Holy Scripture, and with the received faith of the Church. They do not expressly deny the authority of God's Word, but merely sneer at the citation of "proof-texts;" and they apparently would have us believe that *their* doctrine is consistent with that of Christ and his Apostles,—not *logically* consistent, per-

haps,—that would not do,—but consistent in a broad, "large" way,—somehow or other.

In the present discussion, if a doctrine is taught in the Scriptures, that is enough for us; it is established, and we accept it without further ado. And yet we are not willing to let such a doctrine lie under the charge of being unreasonable, unnatural and absurd.

In defence and confirmation of this doctrine of *two classes* only, I might appeal to the analogy of two physical species, where individuals of the one species may approximate individuals of the other almost indefinitely, and yet so as never to transgress or break down the specific distinction. But, without pursuing the argument further in my own words, I venture to give at large a passage from a sermon of Dr. Martineau on the "Forecast of Retribution;" which, besides its intrinsic force, must have the greater weight in view of the quarter from which it comes:

What then can we learn from the historical or external study of our kind? That men exist with infinite variety of spiritual feature, so mingling their lineaments and invisibly melting away their shades as to defy the resources of a narrow classification. But that the characters, as objects of moral judgment, are as various as the *men*, observation gives us not the slightest reason to believe. * * * What is true of one case is true of all. The apparent gradations of character may be all resolvable into varieties in the problem originally set by nature; and in the phenomena which we observe there is nothing to decide on the relative merits of men,—they may all deserve the very same; or their just reward may be two-fold, wide apart as the "Kingdom of our Father" from the outer darkness of weeping and wailing. Thus we may understand how religious men do not feel their classification contradicted by the facts of the world; * * * while the doctrine of a heaven and a hell, with its corresponding classification of mankind * * * has its real seat and strength in the inward reflection upon ourselves and the nature of the right and wrong we do.

The moment we turn to question our own hearts, and judge "not by the seeing of the eye," but by the secret oracle of conscience, all notions of the infinite gradations of character, and of our own freedom from anything very bad or very good, entirely disappear. * * * In the moment of temptation what is the scene really enacted within us? Is it not invariably a controversy, —a struggle,—between two competing passions for occupancy of our will?—passions between which it is ours to decide, and of which we know the one to be nobler, and the other relatively base?

When, as Peter stood with the servants at the fire, the first (?) cock crowing smote upon his heart and told him the thing which

he had done, what was the sad history which he read as he looked in? would he not interpret it thus?—"What have I done? Soul of the rock become weak as water! The deepest love I have, love to the purest of beings,—love backed by all the claims of truth,—I have put away, to give myself up to *fear*, fear for these poor shivering limbs, fear of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do?" Will Peter then think simply that he has done rather amiss, and that it is a pity he was so taken off his guard?—or, that he is a *wretch* who has done the *worst possible* to him?—for how can a man do more than the *very wickedest thing that comes before his choice at the time?* You, indeed, who stand by and look on, may imagine to yourself impulses still more depraved, to which, had he been some other man, he might have yielded; but if these were never present to him, if they never came into the field of his temptation, what are they to him? They are wholly foreign to his problem; in the solution of which he could sink no lower than to accept the proposals of Satan, and decline the answers of God. What consolation would it have brought to the Apostle's bitter tears, to tell him that more shocking things might be imagined,—that, if, for instance, he had gone up to his Master and assassinated him, *that* would have been worse? The suggestion would be but an insult to his remorse, and would operate like the voice of those foolish and heartless comforters, who remind you, as you smart under one sorrow, that you might have had two. * * * Peter would reply, "Go to, thou fool, and blind; Satan gave me the lie to tell; but he put no murderer's dagger in my hand; what more, then, could I do for him, than I have done?"

And suppose Peter had *not* repented.

Yet in all this Dr. Martineau speaks from his purely Deistical point of view. He bases his faith entirely upon the utterances of conscience and attaches no more value to the words of revelation than to those of any ordinary historian. He says in another place:

It can scarcely be that there is not *something* in the great world to come corresponding to the immeasurable difference which reveals itself in our own forecasting souls between holiness and guilt. By what method this felt difference will, however, declare and justify itself, it were vain to surmise; and least of all can we lay any stress on the mythological pictures, to which, in the intensity of their spiritual convictions, prophetic men have had recourse as symbols of the truth they would convey, and the interval they desired to mark. Whether it be Plato's roaring shaft, with its thorny sides and police of fiends, through which the dead must pass, or Christ's undying worm and unquenchable fire, it were childish to take these images for more than solemn hints of an undefinable reality,—or to *imagine that, by dissipating them, you get rid of the penalties of sin.*

2. Of these two states both are alike *eternal* or *everlasting*. From the multitude of cases in which the Scriptures teach or imply this, the following passages are given as brief specimens.

(1) The judgment is final,—an "eternal judgment," Heb. 6. 2. This is presented as one of the elementary principles of the doctrine of Christ.

(2) "These shall go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life." Matt. 25. 46. The punishment is as "eternal" as the life; and must be so understood, unless the contrary can *be shown* to have been self-evident to those in whose ears the words were originally spoken, or manifestly necessary, or at least immediately suggested, in the nature of things. Till then, the plain sense of the text is not to be avoided or evaded with a passing sneer.

(3) "Good for that man if he had never been born." Matt. 26. 24; Mark 14. 21. This could not be if he should ever attain to eternal life.

(4) "Hath not—hath never—forgiveness, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." Luke 12. 10; Matt. 12. 32. Here is clearly one case of eternal punishment, or "eternal sin." Mark 3. 29.

(5) "Shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3. 36. Is not this something absolute and endless? And, like the foregoing and following, it does not depend upon the use of the word αἰώνιος.

(6) "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell,—is able to destroy both soul and body in hell;—yea, I say unto you, fear him." Matt. 10. 28; Luke 12. 4, 5. Will any one quibble upon "hath power" and "is able?" or can any one suppose (without blasphemy, I had almost said), that our Lord, having thus uttered his emphatic and solemn warning to his friends, should have added *sotto voce*, "*is able*, indeed, but you need not be at all afraid, for I solemnly assure you that he *never will;* and this assurance is the very core and marrow of the Gospel which I came into the world to proclaim?" Moreover, that Gehenna (hell) means here more than the Valley of Hinnom is clear from the fact that man, after he had

killed the body, could cast it into that valley, but none besides God can cast it into Gehenna,—can destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.

(7) "Shall be punished with eternal destruction," &c. *Δίκην τίσουσιν ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον.* 2 Thess. 1. 9. Is not this *punishment?* and is it not final?

(8) "The second death." Rev. 20. 14; 21. 8. "There is a sin unto death"—not to be "prayed for." 1 John 5. 16. Where, then, is the room for hope?

Indeed, neither any express promise of Scripture, nor the general drift of Christian doctrine furnishes any positive ground of hope for those who shall be condemned at the last day. They "go into eternal punishment;" and we never hear any more of their history, no, not in one solitary instance.

As to the suggestion of "eternal hope," it is curious enough that, in strictness of logic, it *implies* "eternal punishment;" for, if the punishment should *cease*, what room would there be for the *hope* to continue? And, besides, this "eternal hope," being expressly based, not on direct Scripture promise, but on the presumed demands of man's moral nature, must be coupled with "eternal fear;" for, if in their free will the lost *may* repent, in the same free will the saved may fall away; at least they *might* do so unless kept by special Divine power.

For a further critical examination of the words *αἰώνιος* (eternal), *κόλασις* (punishment), and *γέεννα* (hell), see Excursus 1, 2, 3, in the sequel. But it may be added here that the *κόλασις*, whether vindictive punishment or kindly chastisement, is carried with a *curse* and is to be inflicted in "the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt. 25. 41.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

1. The general position here taken, is, that the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked is plainly taught in the New Testament, according to its simple and natural interpretation; that only by special pleading can that conclusion be avoided; and that, this interpretation having been received and confirmed by the general consent of the Christian Church in all ages, the burden of proof belongs to the other side. It is not proposed at all

to prove the doctrine by abstract, *a priori*, rational or extra-Scriptural argument. And for its opponents to show however elaborately or clearly [see Alger] that such arguments are inconclusive, is nothing at all to the purpose as against the position here taken. While the opponents of the doctrine are constrained to find the proper basis and the chief strength of their whole scheme in such arguments, I shall use them only in refuting or showing the insufficiency of theirs. Here the burden of proof is entirely on their side.

2. The descriptions of the future punishment may be *figurative*, as are those of the future blessedness. Indeed, both undoubtedly are and must be so; but this detracts not from their reality. Both, too, may be by way of natural consequence; but both *may* also have elements of a *positive* character. It is equally unreasonable in either case to infer from the literal interpretations and extravagant representations of certain parties, that therefore either the punishment or the blessedness is not eternal in its duration.

Remove the extravagances and the eternity remains. Yet a long detailing and parading of these extravagances have constituted the principal staple of argument in whole volumes written against the eternity of future punishment.

3. Of the proportion or number of the lost we know nothing definite or certain. But our Lord has said: "Wide is the gate," etc., Matt. 7. 13, 14; cf. Luke 13. 23, 24. God is no more to blame if many sin than if one sin; and the same justice *and love* that punish one sinner may punish—must punish—many sinners. All mankind may be *few* in comparison with the whole number of holy and happy intelligences. And, for mankind, some vast millennium before the final consummation *may* make amends for what had gone before.

4. All who are lost may themselves be satisfied of the justice of their sentence—even if some of their would-be advocates here are not;—and, on the whole, they may choose their own portion, *i. e.*, their own character and spiritual condition, which must determine their state of happiness or misery.

5. Degrees indefinite there may be both in the future happiness and in the future punishment. Their eternity is independent of such considerations.

6. Eternal punishment, therefore, is not infinite punishment. No finite being can commit an infinite sin, or endure an infinite punishment. Intensity of degree as well as eternity of duration is to be taken into the account; and any two must suffer more than each one of them. But there can be but one infinite. No one finite being can suffer infinitely. As the eternity or endlessness of man's existence does not give him an infinite existence, so the *eternity* of punishment does not constitute it *infinite* punishment.

7. The theoretical difficulty lies in God's allowing the existence of *any sin*,—not in the consequent *misery*, nor in both being *eternal*.

8. The eternal punishment of one soul covers the principle. How many, then, may there be, consistently with infinite wisdom, justice and love? Who can fix the limit? But remember the cases of Judas, and of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.

9. The existence of sin and suffering for however short a time covers the principle, in the face of infinite love as well as of infinite justice. How long may they continue? Who can fix the limit? The punishment, then, may certainly be indefinitely long—*longer than any assignable period*. But this is practically and mathematically *eternal;* and to say that it may be thus long but cannot be absolutely and metaphysically "eternal," is, to make a distinction which is neither practical nor logical, and which, besides, is purely arbitrary. Observe, the terms are, not longer than any period *assigned*, but longer than any period *possible* to be assigned.

10. Each man's case must stand on its own bottom, and is not concerned in any offsets or comparisons with the cases or the treatment of others (Matt. 20. 13). The vindication of God's justice in every case by itself is its vindication in all. If the robber who repented on the cross, and went with our Lord to Paradise, had committed murder with his robbery, surely neither reason nor justice would require or admit that the merits or the destiny of that murdered man should be afterwards affected or modified at all by the robber's subsequent repentance. His character and his claims remain just the same, whether his murderer repents or not, and in either case the same as if he had been stricken down by a sudden apoplexy or a stroke of lightning, instead of the assassin's dagger.

11. Man is essentially *free*. The lost soul may go farther and farther from God, the longer the punishment continues. There may be an "eternal sin" as well as an "eternal punishment." Mark 3. 29.

12. "How can the saved be happy while they see or know the torments of the damned?" it is asked. But how can we now be happy while we know that there are all around us almost inconceivable wickedness and wretchedness in the world,—some at every moment committing the most abominable and horrible crimes, and multitudes at every moment in the very agonies of death; and, more than all, so many suffering the most grievous injustice and detestable wrong? Yet we go about our business and our pleasures with wonderful equanimity. How these things may be ordered hereafter we know not. I certainly would not represent the blessed spirits as gloating over the misery of the damned. But they will love the holy will of God above all things; and they may have a deeper sense of the exceeding ill-desert of *all* sin than *we* ever have of the ill-desert of the most atrocious *murder*.

13. This is a subject, in short, to fill us with awe; and our comfort must be that what we cannot understand now we shall know hereafter. But we must beware of rejecting God's truth—God's merciful warnings—because they may not square with our preconceived ideas, or our theoretical notions and expectations.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

1. Against the position that the endlessness of future punishment is taught in the Scriptures, some have thought to find a strong argument in the fact that this unequivocal term *endless* is nowhere in the New Testament expressly conjoined with that punishment. They seem to profess that if it were found so conjoined they would accept the doctrine. But can anybody doubt that if it had been so conjoined we should immediately have been reminded of the "endless genealogies" (*ἀπεράντοις*, 1 Tim. 1. 4) as a proof that, after all, "endless" may not mean endless? Indeed, is it not clear that there is no possible form of words in which Divine Revelation could have taught the doctrine that would

have satisfied and convinced some minds of its truth? If such minds miss the truth, then, whose fault is it?*

2. But, again, it is objected that Eternal Punishment is inconsistent with the *justice* of God.

(*a*) This has incidentally been already in a good measure forestalled and answered.

(*b*) If it is just to punish sin at all, that is, to connect misery with it as its necessary consequence, then it is impossible for us to say *how long* that punishment may not justly continue. It certainly may justly continue as long as the sin continues. But, unless arrested by God's grace, that sin will continue forever; and God is not *in justice* bound to interpose by his converting grace. It is just to leave man freely to work out his own destiny. And thus the charge that eternal punishment is disproportionate to man's finite offences falls away of itself.

(*c*) Indeed this charge of injustice is scarcely any longer urged by the abler assailants of the doctrine of eternal punishment. They cannot even show that such punishment is not *demanded* by the Divine justice. As they reach a deeper sense of that justice, they find that the argument is against them rather than in their favor.

* Many years ago, when Unitarianism was in the prime and freshness of its strength, claiming already to embrace almost all the enlightened Christian intellect of the age, flushed with the confident expectation that, among all men of broad views and clear intelligence, orthodoxy would soon be a thing of the past, exulting in the full consciousness of its own approaching triumph, —it was my fortune to hear a lecture in one of our Eastern cities from a distinguished Unitarian Divine. His discourse, being on the doctrine of the Trinity, was divided into three heads. Two of them were: (1) The doctrine of the Trinity is so tremendous and mysterious, yet so fundamental and necessary, *if true*, that, in case God had intended to reveal it, he would have conveyed the revelation in terms so clear that no honest inquirer on consulting the record could have failed to find it; but many honest and most intelligent students of the Bible cannot find it there;—*ergo*. (2) The doctrine of the Trinity is so utterly contrary to the dictates of reason that no form of words can be conceived, in which it could have been expressed, such, that it would not be more reasonable to interpret them in consistency with Unitarian views than to accept a doctrine so intrinsically absurd as Trinitarianism.—Now, substitute the endlessness of future punishment for the doctrine of the Trinity, and its denial for Unitarianism, and shall we not have very nearly the argumentative position of our opponents?

They rely chiefly upon the weight of the next objection.

3. It is inconsistent with the goodness and the revealed love of God.

(*a*) But here the great mystery is the permission of evil and misery at all,— *if* God could have prevented them consistently with the highest good of the universe. For, if he could not, it is impossible for us to say how long the highest good of the universe may not *demand* the continuance of that permission ; and as long as that demand continues, not only will the existence of sin and misery be consistent with God's infinite love and goodness, but their permission will be absolutely required by them.

(*b*) It may be said that God can, by his gracious interposition, by the presentation of overwhelming motives, ultimately put an end to this sin and consequent misery, and therefore, in his infinite love and goodness he certainly will. We need not deny that he can ; but, if so, then he could also, in the same infinite love and goodness, and by the same means, have prevented the existence of moral evil and misery altogether; —but he has not so done.

(*c*) As to what may be inferred from the revealed love of God in Christ, we must go to the words of the revelation itself to learn that.

The Fatherhood of God and his love in Jesus Christ, as set forth in the New Testament and particularly by Christ himself, have their just limitations, and are plainly seen to be consistent with the most terrible denunciations and the most awful punishments. Christ and his Apostles constantly recognize two classes, the saved and the lost. Our Lord nowhere teaches that all will be saved at the last day, or that they who are then condemned will ever be restored. "God so loved the world," he says, "that he gave his only begotten Son that *whosoever believeth in him* should not perish but should have eternal life." He does not say that all will have eternal life ; but with the eternal life he reveals an "eternal punishment," with the heaven, a hell, a second death,—with the eternal salvation an eternal destruction.

(*d*) For illustrations of the severe side of our blessed Saviour's own teaching, see

Matt. 5. 22, 26, 29, 30 ; 6. 15 ; 7. 13, 14 ; 10. 28 ; 12.

31–34, 45 ; 13. 41, 42 ; 16. 25, 26 ; 18. 6–9, 34, 35 ; 24. 50, 51 ; 25. 30, 41–46 ; 26. 24 ; Mark 3. 29 ; 8. 34–38 ; 9. 42–48 ; Luke 9. 23–26 ; 10. 13–16 ; 12. 4, 5, 9, 10, 47, 48, 59 ; 13. 23–28 ; 14. 24, 26, 27, 33 ; 16. 23–25 ; 19. 26, 27 ; John 3. 36 ; 5. 28, 29 ; 8. 21, 24, 44, 45 ; 12. 48 ; 15. 22–24 ; &c.

For Apostolic teaching, see

Acts 13. 41, 46 ; 17. 30, 31 ; 24. 25 ; Rom. 1. 18–21, 32 ; 2. 2–16 ; 3. 5, 6 ; 6. 23 ; 1 Cor. 8. 11 ; 9. 27 ; 10. 20 ; 2 Cor. 2. 15–17 ; 5. 10, 11 ; Gal. 3. 22 ; 6. 7, 8 ; Eph. 5. 5, 6 ; Phil. 3. 18, 19 ; Col. 3. 6, 25 ; 1 Thess. 5. 3, 9 ; 2 Thess. 1. 6–10 ; 2. 8–12 ; 1 Tim. 5. 24, 25 ; 2 Tim. 3. 13 ; 4. 1 ; Tit. 1. 15, 16 ; Heb. 2. 1–4 ; 3. 11 and 4. 1, 10–13 ; 6. 2 ; 9. 27 ; 10. 26–31, 39 ; 12. 29 ; James 2. 13 ; 5. 1–9 ; 1 Pet. 4. 17, 18 ; 2 Pet. 2. 9, 20–22 ; 3. 10–17 ; 1 John 3. 8–10 ; Jude 10–13 ; Rev. 6. 10, 16 ; 14. 9–12 ; 20. 11–15 ; 21. 27 ; 22. 10–12. .

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Now let "damned" be "condemned," or what you please ; it certainly means "*not saved.*" That infants and unevangelized heathen are not here referred to is readily admitted ; but somebody *is* referred to ; and therefore some are not saved by the Gospel of the love and grace of God.

"Depart, ye cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels ;" * * * "go into hell, into the unquenchable fire ;"—"be cast into hell, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched" * * * "him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell ;" * * * "he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Such are the undoubted words of our Lord Jesus Christ himself. Indeed, the strongest, the severest, the most awful expressions contained in Holy Scripture in reference to eternal punishment, are his own words,—the words of him who so loved us that he gave himself up to die on the accursed tree, that we might be saved from sin and eternal death. If he himself should appear in some of our pulpits now, and should preach *incognito*, using the same tone and language as he used in Jerusalem and Galilee, how many would there be to cry out against this old "traditional," "Puritanic," rigor, this un-Christian rant about the wrath of God instead of his

loving fatherhood, this vulgar raving about damnation, hell, and hell-fire, this coolly consigning of multitudes of his fellow men to everlasting perdition, this gloating over their horrible and hopeless torments! And how would the secular press, and, perhaps, the secularized Church press, too, join in the hue and cry; or, point their comments, it may be, by adding a contemptuous sneer! Or, even if the preacher should be recognized in his proper person, are there not some, perhaps calling themselves Christians, who would coolly suggest, that, in the intensity and fervor of his zeal, he had indulged in extravagant expressions, or, even, had "lost his head?"

(*e*) But it may be insisted that, at all events, it is manifestly impossible that a God of infinite love should create men who, he foreknew, would sin and suffer eternally. We answer that, then, it is equally impossible for a God of infinite love and power and wisdom to create men who, he foreknew, would sin and suffer at all,—when he might have confined himself to creating only those who, he foresaw, would not sin and so would never suffer punishment for sin. For, if it be suggested that God can ultimately reclaim all sinners if he will (as he does reclaim some by his grace in Jesus Christ), and that, therefore, as a God of infinite love, he certainly will; *à fortiori*, he could have prevented all sin if he would, and, therefore, as a God of infinite love, he must have done it. But he has not done it. If it be rejoined that, provided the sinner is ultimately reclaimed he may be made happier than he *could have been* if he had not sinned, and so the demands of God's infinite love may be satisfied in the existence of evil; we answer, that then the sinner will have to rejoice and thank his *sin* for a happiness which Almighty God could not otherwise have bestowed; and a God of infinite love must cherish and delight in that sin as the necessary means of the highest good. For, be it observed, the supposition that the *permission* of sin should be the necessary condition of the highest moral good of the individual or of the universe, is a very different thing from supposing its *commission* to be such a condition. A higher good still might be reached, if, being *permitted*, it were not *committed*. But if such *permission* is necessary for a time, it may be necessary forever. On the other hand, if God, consistently with man's free will and with each man's good

and the good of all, and consequently with his own infinite love, can prevent all men from sinning and suffering *eternally*, then *á fortiori*, he could, with the like consistency, have prevented all men from sinning and suffering at all. But he has not done it. The *existence*, not the *eternity*, of evil, under the government of a God of infinite wisdom, power and goodness, is, therefore, the *real mystery*,—as we said at the first. But this mystery we have undeniably on our hands, for facts cannot be annihilated by any of our fine-spun theoretical or moral demonstrations.

(*f*) But some who count themselves very profound philosophers affirm that the existence and knowledge of evil is a necessary condition to the existence and knowledge of good. If so, the question is: must this evil exist and be known *subjectively* in each moral being as his own? And if so, is this true of God also? And whether true of him or not, would it not certainly follow that all created moral beings must have been made evil or have become so, in order to be good or to know what good is? But, on the other hand, if, to accomplish its beneficent purpose, the evil need not exist subjectively in all; if its *objective* apprehension may suffice for the existence and knowledge of the good,—then we may ask: must it exist in more than one being? and if so, in how many must it be found? Or, if it need to exist for more than one instant, *how long* must it exist, in order that all other moral beings may be duly and forever impressed with the lesson it is intended to teach? Who can say? But unless the subjective experience or the actual object-lesson of the existence of evil were necessary to the existence and knowledge of the good, the lesson of the good could have been conveyed by Divine revelation or learned through a hypothetical or ideal case, a fiction or a fable, without evil ever having existed at all; so that neither to the existence nor to the knowledge of the good was there any need of the existence of the evil. Why then should a God of infinite wisdom, power, and goodness have permitted it? The mystery remains still unsolved and insoluble. But this we *can* see; that if that actual object-lesson were needed at all, then, for aught we know or can prescribe, it may be needed forever. The truth is, the future world may be more nearly analogous to the present state than we are apt to

think. Though the evil will there be subdued, it may not be annihilated. Of the absolute non-existence of evil we have no experience.

4. To the doctrine of eternal punishment it is further objected that the ideal of human excellence, is, to be like God. But Christ requires us to forgive our enemies; it cannot be, therefore, that God should take vengeance on his:—An avenging God—a God of wrath—belongs to the Old Testament, not to the New.

ANSWER.

That is to say; the reason why we must not take vengeance is, that God will not. It is very remarkable how the Apostle Paul reasons to just *the contrary*. "Avenge not yourselves," says he, "but rather leave room for the wrath (of God to take its course); for it is written Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord. Wherefore if thine enemy hunger feed him," etc. Here we see the Apostle boldly says "it is written;" and "therefore it is not abolished; it is still and forever true." The God of the Old Testament is the God of the New Testament. Jehovah is the only living and true God. He has changed none of his attributes. He cannot change. The God of Abraham is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New. Christ cites from *Moses* the first and second commandments of all; and it is to Moses that God revealed his glory as "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;—and that will by no means clear the guilty." We were never commanded, either in the Old Testament or in the New, to be like God in his vindictive justice. That were neither fit nor right nor safe for us. As well might children presume to imitate their father in chastising him or one another; or the private citizen undertake to execute the law upon them that wrong him. He is not to avenge himself, precisely *because* that avenging is reserved to a higher power, *which will execute it*. Such is the reasoning of the Apostle.

That cannot be a doctrine of the New Testament which leads to the rejection of the Old Testament.

5. The doctrine of eternal punishment is inconsistent with what we know of the actual government of God.

We affirm just the contrary.

(1) We see it in the invariableness of Nature's laws. They are inexorable. Their consequences are inevitable, —no entreaty can ward them off or reverse the fixed result,—it remains forever. If the laws of health are violated beyond a certain point, there is no remedy ; death must ensue. Vice may contract diseases which are absolutely incurable. No skill, no prayers, no tears, are of any avail.

(2) We see it in the familiar fact that in the ordinary course of things there are times and seasons appointed for the accomplishment of certain ends ; and if these are neglected, there is no remedy, it is forever too late. If a man has neglected to sow his seed at seed-time, it is forever useles to sow it afterwards, and he may wring his hands in agony at the harvest season, but it will bring him no crop. If a person neglects in youth to cultivate his mind or character, to form good intellectual or moral habits, he must inevitably suffer the consequences during all his subsequent life.

(3) Civil government is a part of God's providential arrangement in the government of the world. But under this a man may for his crimes incur the extreme penalty of the law—capital punishment, which for this world is final and forever.

But now the objector may say : all these are temporal evils, temporal punishments; eternal punishment is quite another thing. God may inflict temporal punishment, it is true, but he cannot inflict eternal punishment. We answer that thus the objector rejects and repudiates the very analogy to which he had appealed. And we renew the appeal to it ourselves.

6. Eternal punishment is contrary to our moral sense and instincts ; it is morally impossible.

ANSWER.

If the allegation were that this punishment was contrary to the moral sense and instincts of mankind, or of developed and civilized mankind, or of Christianly educated mankind,—of Christendom, or of the Christian Church, or of the Christian consciousness,—it might be something to the purpose in form, though it would be

quite untrue in fact. But for a man to set up his own individual moral sense and instincts or those of his petty clique or of his ephemeral school of thought, that he may pass judgment upon the divine administration,—and that against the general judgment of mankind and of the Christian Church, as well as against the plain teaching of Christ and his Apostles,—is altogether another thing. Let it be remembered that the moral sense and moral instincts need to be educated aright in the School of Christ, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit; and that otherwise they are greatly liable to be blinded and perverted. The moral sense and instincts of "to-day" may be quite ephemeral; they are of no more weight than those of yesterday or to-morrow; at all events they cannot claim to be *final* judges. For him who has them, right or wrong, they may settle the question; but they are of little weight in a general argument.

And finally, it must not be forgotten that, beyond all question, the Scripture must be interpreted in the light of the moral sense and instincts of the writers and of their times, and not of any sentimental culture or boasted enlightenment of to-day. But to determine that question we must study the Scripture with the candor of historical criticism, and not as immediately interpreted by our consciousness or moral judgment. These last might lead to the rejection of the Scripture itself as well as of the doctrine in question. But we are not to misinterpret Scripture in order to believe it. God will not thank us for our lie to his glory.

7. Fear is an improper, low and degrading moral motive.

I answer: it may seem so to your moral sense and instincts. But hear again our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. "And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him."

Surely I need say no more, for those who receive the teaching and the Spirit of Christ. But I may add that hope is no more proper a motive than fear; yet the New Testament is full of appeals to this motive; "the hope of glory" is the culmination of all for which we have to be thankful, and hope is one of the three cardi-

nal Christian graces. In the Gospel fear is, of course, less frequently appealed to; but it is by no means left out of the account. The danger is set before us on the one side, as well as the refuge on the other; and we are not faithful to evangelical teaching if we do not show men the dark and severe side of the divine economy as well as the bright and gracious side.

The truth is, that in contradiction to the objector's sublimated ethics, hope and fear are the two great practical goads and levers to all human activity. Without them every movement in the vast machinery of human society would be stopped; every sound would be hushed; every muscle would be paralyzed; all enterprise would be arrested; all rational endeavor would cease.

8. To what has already been said in answer to objections it is proper that one general critical observation should be added. It is often thought that, in view of the benevolent character of our Blessed Lord and of the general current of his gracious teaching, we are bound to interpret his sterner expressions in the mildest sense possible. But just the contrary seems to be the natural and logical conclusion. If we should grant that those expressions, considered in themselves, might bear the objector's interpretation; he must also grant that, beyond any question, they are *susceptible* of the interpretation which is commonly given them, and which seems most naturally to lie on their face. They seem to mean, they sound like, they certainly *may* mean, *endless punishment.* No word is ever said in connection with them to avert or guard against that meaning. Now, this being the case, is it to be believed, in view of the gentleness of Christ's character and teaching, that he would have used, and that systematically, such harsh and horrid expressions as hell, hell-fire, eternal punishment, eternal fire with the devil and his angels, both soul and body destroyed in hell,—when he meant nothing so very dreadful after all? Could his gentle spirit *indulge* in horrible images and expressions for the mere pleasure of it, and without any necessity in the truth of the case? Rather, with his heart overflowing with compassion and glowing with tenderest love, would he not have used,—as the objector thinks it now most consistent with Christian feeling to use,—the kindest and gentlest language possible consis-

tent with the character of the facts? The *stern reality*, therefore, cannot fall short of the *sternest interpretation* of his solemn words. What must be meant by "ye cursed" from the lips of Jesus Christ? One might think to nerve himself in Stoic or Satanic pride against all "the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God;" but who can stand before "the wrath of the Lamb?" Matt. 25. 41; Rev. 19, 15; 6. 16.

9. But it may be urged, Christ came to save us from sin and not from hell-fire. I answer, *that* is but half the truth; omit the "not," and say, he came to save us from both; and add, if you please, that salvation from the latter without salvation from the former would have been a perfect nullity; and then you will say the whole truth. When it is said: "Jesus shall save his people from their sins," observe it is "*their* sins," the sins they have committed; not from sins to come, but from sins past; and that, not by annihilating those sins, for as facts they cannot be annihilated, nor simply and directly by preventing the sinning more, but by securing *their forgiveness*, and *thus* saving from their *consequences*. It is true, as has been said above, that one of the most inevitable and most fatal consequences of sin, is, continuing to sin, sinning more; but that is not the *only* consequence and punishment of sin. It is indeed the most fearful consequence; but only that, *because*, unless arrested, it carries with it, intensifies, and renders hopeless all the other consequences. Jesus came to save us from our sins, *i. e.*, from *all* their ultimate consequences; to save sinners, those who *have* sinned, even the chief; to procure the forgiveness of their sins, so that the beloved Apostle says: "If any man sin," actually commit sin, be already a sinner, "we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins." Christ came to deliver us not only from the power but from the punishment, the condemnation, of sin; not only for our sanctification but for our justification; to secure not only our purifying but our pardon; —*our sins are forgiven for his name's sake*. If punishment did not cling to the very nature of sin, neither its existence nor its continuance could be recognized as an evil or wrong. From the grasp of this punishment, taken in all its relations, and including the propagating power of sin, nothing can deliver us but God's forgiv-

ing grace. Let us have the whole truth. Half truths, however beautiful and pithy, are dangerously misleading. The more specious and pointed they seem, the more disastrous they really are. In practical effect they are the very worst of falsehoods. Christ would not have come to save us from *our sins*, he would not have offered himself to be a propitiation for *our sins*, if there had been no consequences, no punishment, of sin, from which we could be saved.

The vulgar extravagances of those who uphold the doctrine of eternal punishment, their narrowness and one-sidedness are often held up to odium and contempt; but, so far as I know, the most one-sided, narrow-minded, and rabid of them all,—though they have made comparatively too much account of hell-fire,—have never gone so far as to say that "Jesus came to save his people from hell-fire, and *not* from the love and power of sin." They have retained the whole truth. But here we are told, as the latest discovery of the large, lofty, and liberal views of to-day, that "Jesus came to save his people from their sins, and *not* from hell-fire." Has he, then, left them unsaved from hell-fire? Is not the truth simply this; that Christ, *in* saving his people from *their* sin, saves them from all its fearful consequences, from hell-fire, or whatever he himself meant by those his own peculiar words?

UNIVERSALISM.

Universalism has assumed a variety of forms; but only two are of sufficient plausibility or currency to call for special discussion. These are

I. No punishment hereafter.

II. The final restoration of all.

I. NO FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

1. That there will be no punishment hereafter was argued from God's infinite power and mercy;—in this wise. If God can regenerate, sanctify and save some sinful men in Jesus Christ, he can finally regenerate, sanctify and save all, if he will; and if he can thus save all finally, he can save all immediately after death, if he will; for an intermediate punishment could have no good effect towards reforming the sinner. Therefore either God is impotent or unmerciful, or else there will be no future punishment. And, besides, they appealed to our moral sense and instincts. But if they were asked why, then, God does not regenerate, sanctify and save all men in this world, they could only answer, with the later school, by rejecting the analogy between the temporal and the eternal altogether.

2. But this doctrine of no punishment at all hereafter is so manifestly unscriptural and unreasonable, that it requires no answer, and indeed, so far as I know, has few if any advocates left. It remains to discuss the doctrine of

II. THE FINAL RESTORATION OF ALL.

1. The *à priori* arguments drawn from the nature and character of God, from his infinite power and wisdom, his justice and love, have already been sufficiently considered under the head of "Objections" to the doctrine of eternal punishment; as also the arguments from analogy, from our moral sense, and from the high moral motives of Christianity.

2. The arguments for a future probation have also been answered. And we may again add to them that the nature of sin without grace is to beget more sin, to become more sinful, to grow and to propagate itself (Rev. 22. 11).

3. There is one general argument which may call for further discussion, viz.: that all just punishment is *disciplinary*, intended and fitted for the reformation of the offender;—and therefore temporary.

(*a*) But in such a case all just punishment becomes mere chastisement, and "whom God *loveth* he chasteneth." It would then be, not a blessing but the contrary, to be delivered from the punishment until it had accomplished its end; when deliverance would come of course without need of a Redeemer. The Scripture says we are "saved from *wrath* through Christ;" but according to this there is no wrath to be saved from, and if there were, to save us from it would only be an injury; just as it is an injury to the refractory child to be delivered from that chastisement which is designed and adapted to promote its good.

(*b*) Human justice would be abolished, as well as capital punishment, if all penalties were required to be disciplinary or eleemosynary. Punishments are *deterrent*. To deter men from offending is the principal object of human punishment. (See Blackstone.) And God is expressly said in Scripture to "take vengeance," to "execute wrath;" and it is said of Sodom and Gomorrah that they "are set forth as an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," (Jude 7). Here certainly is an instance of exemplary punishment. This theory of punishment would not only abolish human justice but would annul the very *idea* of retributive justice altogether.

4. It is an acknowledged part of the doctrine of the restorationists that every one suffers sooner or later all that he deserves. "We deserve no more suffering," say they, "than that which is best calculated to promote our good; and every one is sure to receive that." But if so, then, again, to be delivered from this, or from any part of this, would not be salvation but an injury. Besides, the Scriptures represent that all who are saved are saved by grace,—saved by Christ,—are forgiven, justified, &c. But what grace in delivering those

from further miseries who have endured all that they deserve? And how do such persons need the interposition of Christ? They have suffered all that they deserve, and have nothing more to endure or fear. What need have such persons of salvation? They have suffered the whole penalty of the law, paid their debt to the uttermost farthing; and what is there left to be forgiven? But the Scriptures speak of some who are never to be forgiven, and consequently are never to be saved:—"Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," (Matt. 12. 32). According to this doctrine there is no difference between wrath and mercy, between vengeance and grace; words are emptied of their proper signification, and anything may mean anything. This is called "a free handling" of the word of God; and indeed it is.

5. It remains to treat of the arguments for a final restoration of all, drawn from the Scriptures themselves.

(1) The early Universalists frankly admitted that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of eternal punishment; but they said it was not a revealed doctrine, but was borrowed from the heathen and from the Pharisees, and adopted in the Scriptures out of accommodation to prevailing prejudices, (see *Alger's* Future State, pp. 525, 526). And it is to be especially noted that infidel critics, and men generally who reject the divine authority of the Scripture, do not fail to see clearly that it does teach this doctrine.

(2) We may add that, according to the testimony of Josephus, this *was* the doctrine of the Pharisees in the time of Christ; and the Sadducees are of course to be left out of the account, as they believed in no future state at all:—(Vide Joseph. Bell. Jud. II. viii. 14, and Antiq. XVIII. i. 3.) That some of the Rabbins held a different doctrine is very possible; they may have had Sadducean notions.

(3) It may be added, further, that almost all the early Fathers, and the primitive and Catholic Church have received this doctrine with one consent as being taught in Holy Scripture;—except Origen and his school, who were notorious for their "free handling" of the word of God.

(4) In proceeding to discuss the passages of Scrip-

ture alleged by the restorationists, two principles of interpretation or canons of criticism must be carefully borne in mind:

(*a*) General propositions are *limited* by particulars, not particulars *annulled* by generals. "Death passed upon all men,"—says the Apostle. Yet we do not doubt that Enoch and Elijah were translated. But really this point needs no illustration.

(*b*) Nothing is more common, not only in Biblical but in ordinary discourse, than the using of "all" not in its absolute sense but in a relative or modified, a general or partial application. As, "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh," Acts 2. 17; "One man believeth that he may eat all things," Rom. 14. 2; "He hath done all things well," Mark 7. 37; "The Gospel shall be preached in all the world, unto all nations," (Matt. 24. 14) before the destruction of Jerusalem.

And the Apostle says that in his time "the Gospel was preached to all the creation (or to every creature) under heaven," Col. 1. 23; "God who quickeneth all things," 1 Tim. 6. 13; "Who giveth us all things," verse 17; "Ye know all things," 1 John 2. 20; "The Lord give thee understanding in all things," 2 Tim. 2. 7; "Them that sin rebuke before all," 1 Tim. 5. 20; "Strengthened with all might," Col. 1. 11; "Let your moderation be known unto all men," Phil. 4. 5; "Let us do good unto all men," Gal. 6. 10; "Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," 1 Cor. 13. 7; "He that is spiritual judgeth all things," 1 Cor. 2. 15; "He healed them all," Matt. 12. 15; "I have showed you all things," Acts 20. 35; "I please all men in all things," 1 Cor. 10. 33; "All the Greeks took Sosthenes and beat him," Acts 18. 17; "Do all things without murmurings and disputings," Phil. 2. 14; "We do all things for your edifying," 2 Cor. 12. 19.—These last and many others may be explained by another passage: "*Whatsoever* ye *do*, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus," Col. 3. 17.—But enough; such cases are innumerable. The mere use of the word "all" cannot be urged as demonstrating absolute universality.

(5) For the doctrine of final restoration passages of Scripture are alleged which declare it to be God's will that all should be saved. But in such cases the differ-

ent meanings of will,—as desire or good pleasure, or command, or purpose,—must be taken into account; as also the context and GENERAL DRIFT of the discourse.

1 Tim. 2. 4 is alleged: "God will have all men to be, (or wills that all men should be) saved." And so he wills that all men should always keep his commandments; but they do not. And do "all men come to repentance and the knowledge of the truth?" But compare 1 Tim. 6. 9, 12; 2 Tim. 3. 13; and especially 2 Pet. 2. 9; 3. 9.

1 Tim. 4. 10 is alleged: "The Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe." But here a limiting distinction is expressly made.

John 3. 17. "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." But see the immediately preceding and following verses, and 2 Pet. 2. 9, and 3. 7, 9, 10.

John 12. 32. "I will draw all men unto me." This is simply a future tense; and compare verses 37, 47, 48; also John 3. 14-21; 5. 24, 28, 29, 40; 6. 44, 45; 8. 21; 10. 26-28 and Mark 16. 16. Though drawn, some will not come.

(6) Texts are quoted which only prove the universality of Christ's atonement; as, "who gave himself a ransom for all," 1 Tim. 2. 6; "He tasted death for every man," Heb. 2. 9, &c. The redemption is designed for all, sufficient for all, offered to all; but it does not follow that all will actually receive it. Every maple seed is manifestly designed to produce a new maple tree; but many fail of that effect.

(7) Other Scriptures are quoted which merely express God's universal benevolence; as, "Not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance," 2 Pet. 3. 9. There note the connection; and see 2 Pet. 2. 9.

(8) Others are quoted which merely express God's universal good providence; as, "The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." But there is much sin and misery in the world for all that.

(9) Other passages are quoted which simply express God's readiness to forgive and restore his chosen people; as, "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide, neither will he keep his anger forever." This manifestly

refers to his temporal chastisements of his people. And this, moreover, is from the Old Testament, whose God is admitted to be a God of vengeance.

(10) There remain four or five Scripture texts on which the restorationists chiefly rely ; viz., Rom. 5. 18, 19 ; Eph. 1. 10 ; Col. 1. 20, and 1 Cor. 15. 28, with Phil. 2. 10. Of these in order: *Rom. 5. 18, 19.* "Therefore as by one offence judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by one righteousness the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall the many be made righteous." But this does not hinder the Apostle's conclusion, further on, that the end of disobedience—"the end of those things—is *death*," "the wages of sin is—is still—*death*," 6. 21–23. Compare also Rom. 2. 6–16 ; 4. 24 ; 2 Thess. 1. 5–10 ; 2. 10–13 ; 1 Cor. 15. 22 and 23.

Adam did not *actually* involve his whole race in *eternal* death, but he exposed them to it. In contrast with this, the second Adam does not actually bring all men into the possession of eternal life ; but he puts them in the way of it, he sets it before them.

Eph. 1. 10. "Unto the dispensation of the fulness of the times, to bring under a head (or gather or sum up) all things in Christ, the things in heaven and the things upon earth, even in him." Here it is manifest that not the absolute universality of the things but the *one headship* of Christ is with the Apostle the emphatic point ; —all things that are to be brought under a head or gathered or summed up, from whatever quarter, are to be brought under a head, gathered or summed up *in Christ*. Compare : "Do all things in the name of the Lord Jesus," *i.e.*, all things "whatsoever ye do." And see the close of the chapter : "And he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the *fulness* of him that filleth all in all." But the Church does not absolutely include all things. See also 2. 2–7 ; showing that the Apostle recognizes some who are not gathered into the Church, and thus brought under the gentle sway of Christ. See also 3. 6, 9, 10 ; where it appears that this gathering of all, or bringing all under a head in Christ, is especially a bringing of all, *i.e.*, both Jews

and Gentiles, into his Church; while at 4. 17–20, it appears that not all the Gentiles are brought in, but some "give themselves over unto lasciviousness to work all uncleanness with greediness."

Col. 1. 20. "He is the head of the body, the Church; for it pleased the Father that in him should all the *fulness* dwell; and through him to reconcile all things unto himself." Here applies the same comment as before:—all things that are to be reconciled are to be reconciled *in him.* And see the following verses 21–27, showing the contrast which is recognized between those who are in the Church and those who are out of it; and that the calling of the *Gentiles* as well as of the Jews is what the Apostle has especially in view, when he uses the word "all."

1 Cor. 15. 25, 27, 28. "Till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. For, he hath put all things in subjection under his feet. But when all things shall be subdued unto him," &c. But this is expressly the subduing and subjection of *enemies;* who shall be put under his feet,—made his footstool. See the same at Matt. 22. 44: "Till I make thine enemies thy footstool;" Heb. 2. 8: "Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet."

But those who become the loving, willing, happy subjects of Christ's kingdom are *never* spoken of as being "put under his feet," or made "his footstool." Rather they sit with him on his throne and reign with him forever and ever. The subjugation of foes is far from being their restoration or salvation.

Phil. 2. 10. "That at (or in) the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

That is to say, all shall be made to acknowledge his sovereignty, whether willingly or unwillingly; as appears from Rom. 14. 11, 12: "Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God; so then (adds the Apostle) every one of us shall give account of himself to God"—which certainly does not imply that every one shall be recognized and accepted as a child of God. All shall stand before his judgment seat and submit to his authority.

But even if this passage in Philippians were admitted to be a description of loving and willing submission and adoration, its expressions of universality could not be insisted upon as absolute ; as we shall see by comparing it with Rev. 5. 13 ; "And every created thing which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying : Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever."

Now here are the strongest possible expressions of universality, much stronger than those in Philippians ; and yet note the scenes and events immediately following; which show that there were enemies still remaining to be subdued and punished. See also, after this, Rev. 21. 5, 7, 8 ; "And he that sitteth on the throne said, behold I make all things new. * * * He that overcometh shall inherit these things, and I will be his God and he shall be my son. But for the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." So then, it seems that "making *all things* new" does not abolish sin nor the second death. And finally, as if unequivocally to cut off all hope of a final restoration of those who are consigned to the second death, consider what was afterwards revealed to St. John, in the last chapter of the New Testament ; Rev. 22. 10, 11, "And he saith unto me, Seal not up the words of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand. He that is unrighteous let him do unrighteousness yet more (or still); and he that is filthy let him be made filthy yet more ; and he that is righteous let him do righteousness yet more, and he that is holy let him be made holy yet more." Here is the law that will control the history of the future world. There is no tendency in the two extremes to come together. The inherent tendency and the inevitable result are an *eternal divergence*. The one moves forever upward, the other moves forever downward ; and that by a law not of physical or outward compulsion but of the inward necessity of moral freedom.

But perhaps the desperation of the Universalists for proof-texts is nowhere more strikingly illustrated than in

their appeal to Ps. 139. 8: "If I make my bed in hell, behold, Thou art there;"—as though they would have us think that hell must therefore be quite a cheerful place.* They seem to forget that, from the very necessity of his being, God is present *everywhere;* but that, nevertheless, some places and some people are intensely gloomy and miserable. And not only so, but they also forget,—or, if *they* do not, they would have their *readers* forget, that, in the Old Testament, "hell" never stands for Gehenna, but for Sheol (or Hades), "the place of departed spirits;" to which the patriarch Jacob went as well as the king of Babylon.

* See Archdeacon Farrar's "Eternal Hope," p. 219; where the citation is emphasized and enforced by appending a long poetic extract. It is curious that, of thirty texts of Scripture, which the Archdeacon has cited *seriatim*, *eight* are from the Old Testament; while, yet, in a later article (N. Am. Rev., March, 1885), he protests *especially* against the *perversion* whereby "passages from the Old Testament are adduced in this controversy." In the foregoing argument that "perversion" has been entirely avoided, and that, as a matter of course, and without the slightest effort.

ANNIHILATION OR CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY.

It is sometimes said, with much emphasis and a large display of eloquence, by those who are regarded as the representatives of the broad views of "to-day," and as the special vindicators of the love and "fatherhood" of God, that God will punish the *sin* but not the *sinner*. But how this can be done remains a problem which they say not a word to explain. How is sin in the abstract to suffer punishment,—punishment where there is no conscious being to feel or know it? God may hate the sin, and not the sinner; he hates nothing that he has made. But to punish the sin without punishing the sinner is quite another thing. Penalty to be penalty, pain, suffering, must be felt by some one. How any inward or outward suffering or penalty, whether eternal fire or remorse of conscience or any other punishment, can befall the sin without reaching the sinner, exceeds all the power of the ordinary human mind to conceive. It must be a brand-new invention of the "large and liberal culture of to-day;" or perhaps of the freshest newspaper theology.

But however this may be, it is plain that those who believe in the annihilation of the wicked as their punishment, agree with those who maintain the doctrine of eternal punishment in this: that the punishment, whatever it be, and however long continued, falls upon the sinner himself, and not merely upon his sin. They do not propose even to annihilate the sin (not to say, to punish it) otherwise than by annihilating the sinner.

It remains, then, finally to discuss this other theory, as it is opposed to the doctrine of eternal punishment; a theory which is sometimes called "conditional immortality" and sometimes "the annihilation of the wicked." It teaches that immortality is conditioned upon union with Christ; and that those who have not received this gift from him will cease to exist as personal

and conscious beings, either at death or after the resurrection.

1. Some suppose that for the wicked death is an *eternal sleep*. But for the wicked death is, in the New Testament, I believe, never called "sleep." Moreover, the Scriptures expressly declare that the wicked will be raised from the dead. See John 5. 28,29, and Acts 24. 15.

2. Others suppose that in the intermediate state the wicked, or both the righteous and the wicked, will sleep in complete unconsciousness. They reject the immortality of *the soul* and claim immortality only for *the man* in the resurrection. But, for the contrast of soul and body, and for the life of the soul after the body is killed, see Matt 10. 28: "Fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell;" and compare Luke 12. 5, "Fear him which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell." And for the intermediate state, see again Luke 16. 19, &c. (Dives and Lazarus); 23. 43 (thief in Paradise); Phil. 1. 23 (far better to be with Christ); and 2 Cor. 5. 6, 8 (absent from the body present with the Lord).

3. The doctrine of conditional immortality rests on what I may venture to call two mistakes. (1) The first mistake is in regard to the meaning of "eternal life,"—confounding it with mere continuance of conscious existence. Whereas it is never imparted but to those who were already in possession of conscious existence, and such existence continues in entire independence of it. "The wages of sin is death," saith the Apostle; "but the gift of God is eternal life." But he surely must mean spiritual death as well as spiritual life. Now spiritual or moral death does not, any more than natural death, involve cessation or annihilation of *being*. It rather implies a continuance of existence in sin and misery. It is the annihilation or the absence of the holiness and happiness wherein eternal life consists. Men morally and spiritually dead are living now—are in conscious existence all around us; and they so remain unless, and until, they receive from Christ, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, spiritual life, the new life unto righteousness. This spiritual and eternal life, and this spiritual and eternal death are equally consistent with, and indeed equally imply, the continuance of conscious personal

existence. As "eternal life" does not mean mere unending existence but spiritual life *and* everlasting blessedness; so the "second death" does not mean cessation of existence but spiritual, moral death *and* everlasting misery. As eternal life is an eternal living, so may eternal death be an eternal dying.

4. The doctrine of the annihilation or final extinction of the wicked rests (2) on a mistake in regard to the use in Scripture of the terms "death" and "destruction" in describing their future destiny;—in such texts as 2 Thess. 1. 9 (shall be punished with eternal destruction, &c.). But see Mark 3. 29 (liable to eternal sin); 9. 44 (their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched); Rom. 2. 6–16 (indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish); Rev. 22. 11 (unrighteous still). This death or destruction evidently cannot mean the annihilation of being. Indeed, eternal death or destruction, in the sense of eternal annihilation, would be an eternal incongruity, if not a downright contradiction.

5. Here difficult questions demand solution. If the extinction or annihilation of the wicked is to take place after their resurrection, will it be *immediately* after, or with a previous *indefinite* interval of torment and suffering? And, in either case, will it be a *positive* infliction or a *natural* process? If a mere natural process, how then will it be with their resurrection? Will that be a natural process also?

6. If on the other hand it is to be a positive infliction, to what purpose will it be imposed?

(*a*) It will do its subjects no good as a *punishment.* Is it then a mercy, a blessing? But see Matt. 25. 45, 46, and 2 Thess. 1. 9. Such words have not the air of *benedictions.*

(*b*) If it is to be for the good of *others* as an example,—then a *principle* is admitted; and what if it might be still more effective to that end if continued forever? or what if, not being so continued, its impression should ultimately wear off?

(*c*) Could the saints endure to see their dear friends annihilated? And suppose they should never forget it, but retain perpetually a vivid recollection of the scene and the fact? So this old difficulty is not escaped.

(*d*) If it is to be regarded as a vindication of the Divine justice, a *principle,* again, is admitted; and who can fix

the precise limit to the punishment required for that vindication?

(*e*) Those who teach this doctrine *must* regard this annihilation as a *punishment*, for they give it as the meaning of Christ's phrase, "eternal punishment;" and this punishment, as will appear (Excursus 2), cannot be a mere chastisement, nor could they without self-contradiction so consider it. But annihilation would be no punishment to the wicked, or would be less and less so as they are more wicked. To the good man it might seem a horrible infliction, but to them it is the end to, and a release from, all punishment.

7. It is to be observed that all the objections to eternal punishment drawn from God's character and fatherhood, from his foreknowledge and predestination, remain in full force against this doctrine also.

8. The highest happiness of the universe is not thus attained. There are so many utter and acknowledged failures. They are God's *hors d'œuvres*. They did no good before, they do no good afterward.

9. But what is most particularly to be noted, is, that this punishment by annihilation is manifestly and emphatically not *disciplinary*, not *remedial* or *reformatory*. Now this is the most specious, popular and prevailing objection that is made against the doctrine of eternal punishment. But let those who feel the weight of this objection choose between eternal punishment which eternally respects man's moral freedom, and this gross physical doctrine of annihilation. To such minds what can be more absolutely a gratuitous cruelty than to raise men from the dead simply to punish them with instant annihilation? unless it be that other theory that they are *tortured* for a season, perhaps for a long indefinite period,—who can tell how long?—previously to their annihilation?

10. Some of the advocates for this doctrine of conditional immortality endeavor to find a ground for their theory in the assumption that Christ's body (how about the blood?), received in the Holy Supper, is the germ of the spiritual body, and so the physical basis of immortality. But this is a mere fancy,—materialistic withal, and *very* narrow.

11. If it be suggested, in reference to the condition of the finally lost, that sin being in its nature the negation

of being will gradually lead to the ultimate extinction of their conscious existence, and that this is what our Lord meant by "eternal punishment;"—it would seem to follow that the greater the sin the more speedily will this extinction be reached. And *if so*, then three things:

(1) So far as the "punishment" is supposed to consist entirely or chiefly in the *lingering process* of extinction, the most wicked will suffer the least punishment.

(2) So far as the punishment is supposed to consist entirely or chiefly in the termination or completion of that process in the ultimate extinction of conscious being,—then, if there were *no termination*, if the process were *unending*, there would be less punishment, or none at all.

(3) Or if, as the solution of the case, the gradations of the punishment are supposed to be determined by variations in the *intensity* of the sin and suffering, rather than in the *extent* of their duration, we have merely to add that there is nothing incompatible with the doctrine of eternal or unending future punishment, in supposing that that punishment (the sin and the suffering) will be graduated all the way from the mere privation of heavenly blessedness up to (or down to) whatever degree of sin and suffering one may choose to suggest. But we are always to remember that it is the "eternal sin" that involves the eternal suffering (Mark 3. 29, Gr.); and it is the saddest element in the condition of the lost, that, according to the laws of our moral being, *that* condition must involve a constant process of moral deterioration.

To repeat and emphasize what has substantially been said before:—the "eternal life" of the New Testament is not the *unending continuance* of *conscious existence;* its bestowal is not the bestowal of conscious existence; it is bestowed only on those who already possess conscious rational being; and consequently its absence, or "eternal death," does not involve the want or the extinction of conscious existence or of natural immortality.

12. As to the moral bearing of this doctrine of annihilation,—it would seem to lead straight to the epicurean maxim: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." It would remove from the minds of many bad men the only barrier that keeps them back from *suicide*.

13. In fine, it is a point worthy of especial consideration, that neither universalists nor annihilationists can

find any passages in Scripture in which their doctrine is formally stated and developed ; while those who hold the doctrine of eternal punishment find the clearest and strongest statements, which they can make, in the very words of Holy Scripture, and particularly in those of Our Lord Jesus Christ. And, moreover, while such passages as are urged by the opponents of this doctrine are almost invariably accompanied with circumstances and statements which strip them of their desired force as proofs ; those, on the other hand, which are alleged for the doctrine of eternal punishment are usually left in Scripture to their full natural meaning and force, without one word ever being said upon the spot for their limitation or mitigation.

14. For the doctrine of our Church on this whole subject, see the Litany : "Thy wrath and everlasting damnation ;" the burial service : "the bitter pains of eternal death ;" the creed : "judgment ;" "life everlasting ;" the articles : "to deliver from curse and damnation ;" and "the horrible punishment" spoken of in the office for the ordination of priests.

APPENDIX.

EXCURSUS (1).

ON THE WORD *αἰώνιος*.

I have thought best to reserve what is to be said on this word for a separate consideration.

1. This term is applied to our life in Christ, to spiritual life, because that spiritual life is everlasting, and not because *αἰώνιος* means spiritual. Our life in Christ, our spiritual life, has a *content* which is holiness and consequent blessedness, and a *duration* which is eternal.

2. This term must *always* have reference to duration. Even absolute eternity must for our minds be brought under that relation—as "the eternal God:"—this must express God's existence as ever-during, without beginning or end in time. If we eliminate the idea of duration, the meaning of eternity is gone.

3. This term in some connections undoubtedly means less than everlasting, but no more than does "everlasting" itself. But in a vast majority of cases, it means everlasting in its full and proper sense.

4. Whether this term, or the term everlasting in English, is to be taken, in any given case, in the stricter or in the looser sense must be determined by the connection and by the nature of the case. But the nature of the case must be determined in the light of the times in which it was used, and not in that of the "fresh thought" and special culture of "to-day."

5. For the use of the Hebrew and Greek words at large:

A. Old Testament.

(1) *Ôlâm* is used for past time in 52 instances—about ⅛ of its usage in the Bible, viz., 415 times.

(2) It is not used in a single instance to designate a limited or definite period either past or future.

(3) It has two meanings in reference to the future,—one indefinite and one *infinite*;—determined by the connection; just as we use "forever" and "everlasting" in our common speech. At the same time, it is unquestionable that it is generally employed to express the infinite future. It is much more frequently so employed than any other Hebrew word or words.

(4) To describe the infinite and eternal God or what belongs to him, it is used 76 times; and if this does not mean eternal there is no word or combination of words in Hebrew to tell us of the infinite past or boundless future. It therefore means eternal or everlasting in all cases where the connection properly understood does not positively show that it is more restricted.

(5) In all but 7 places, it is translated by *αἰών* or *αἰώνιος*—in the Septuagint.

B. New Testament.

(1) In some 33 instances *αἰών* is used for *world* without any certain reference to *time*. (These may be set aside.)

(2) It is used 71 times when it has reference to *time* past or future. The adjective *αἰώνιος* always follows this sense—it never means *mundane* or *worldly* or *temporary* in distinction from eternal.

(3) *Ἀεών* is used with reference to the indefinite past 7 times, and *αἰώνιος* 3 times. Leaving out these and those passages also in which it refers to future retribution, we find *αἰών* for the indefinite or infinite future 55 times, and *αἰώνιος* 59 times.

(4) These words are applied to God, his glory and kingdom 38 times, and 62 times to the blessedness of the righteous; 15 times to the retribution of the wicked, and 15 times in a miscellaneous way,—in these last, just as we use the English word *forever*, as of the barren fig tree—Matt. 21. 19, Mark 11. 14—both, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

C. Deductions.

Thus, then, (1) *Ôlâm* in Hebrew is the word used many times more than all others to express eternal dura-

tion; (2) This word is rendered in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which was in use in the time of our Saviour, by *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, nearly 50 times to one of its being rendered by any other word; thus proving that these were the words in general use in the days of Christ to express the meaning "forever" and "everlasting" of the Hebrew *Ôlâm*.

(3) This meaning of these words is confirmed throughout by the usage of them in the New Testament. For, if we leave out 33 instances where *αἰών* does not relate to duration, and the ten in which its derivatives relate to the past in the sense of ancient times or from everlasting; and further leave out, for the present, the 15 which apply to future retribution (of the wicked), we find these words, one or the other, 115 times; one hundred, or more than three-fourths of them, relate to God or the blessedness of his people, and the remaining 15 are in general correctly translated *forever* or *everlasting*, but sometimes in the sense of always or perpetually, or with a negative "never," as when Peter says, "Thou shalt *never* wash my feet," John 13. 8, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. It is to be carefully noted that, while the noun *αἰών* with a preposition used adverbially in the sense of forever is applied, as in this case, simply to all future time, or to the whole future life, or to the whole period within which the contrary would seem naturally possible, the adjective *αἰώνιος* is never used, in the New Testament, except in the sense of eternal, having reference either to the past or to the future;—*unless we except* those instances in which it is applied to the future condition of the wicked.

Shall these be excepted? (Bib. Sac., April, 1878.)

Sodom and Gomorrah, "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire," (Jude 7,)—may be cited to show that the word *αἰώνιος* in such connections need not mean properly "eternal," unless it is as implying annihilation. In answer,—we should rather say: "unless it is" *as excluding all restoration.* We are *all agreed* that the "hell-fire" and the "eternal fire" of our Lord are figurative expressions; St. Jude, therefore, means that Sodom and Gomorrah suffer what is a type and symbol of *eternal*

punishment; and, in their case, as in the other, the effects are endlessly remediless.

NOTE.—Some, in order to show that eternal punishment may not properly mean everlasting punishment, have suggested that the Sacred writers, whether in the Hebrew or in the Greek, regarded eternity as a long indefinite period, as a grand cycle, an age, or many ages, but had never formed the metaphysical conception of absolute eternity. If so, it follows of course, that we have no *revealed* authority for believing that God himself is eternal in the absolute metaphysical sense; and nobody has supposed that eternal punishment will last longer than God does.

EXCURSUS (2).

IS κόλασις MERELY CHASTISEMENT?

1. In Matt. 25. 46, κόλασις is expressly "eternal"—as eternal as the bliss of the righteous; and those to whom it is assigned are expressly dismissed with a *curse* into the eternal fire; which does not give it the air of a fatherly chastisement.

2. The proper words for *chastise, chastisement*, παιδεύω, παιδεία, are never in the New Testament used to describe the sufferings of those condemned at the last judgment, cf. 1 Cor. 11. 32; Heb. 12. 5–11.

3. In Acts 4. 21, "Finding nothing how they might punish them," κολάζω seems to be used in the same sense as τιμωρέω in Acts 22. 5—"Bound to Jerusalem to be punished;" and Acts 26. 11, "I punished them in every synagogue."

4. In 2 Pet. 2. 9, κολάζω, "To reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished,' seems to mean something *final*—more than mere chastisement.

5. In Heb. 10. 29. "Of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy," τιμωρία seems to be used in much the same sense as κόλασις in St. Matt. and in application to the same case.

6. In 2 Thess. 1. 9, δίκην τίνω, "Who shall be punished (suffer vengeance) with eternal destruction," has the same application as κόλασις in St. Matt., and can hardly be supposed to mean mere temporary and kindly chastisement. In any event, the finally condemned are thus said to suffer not only κόλασις—whatever that may

mean—but also τιμωρία, and, δίκην τίνειν—whatever those terms may mean.

7. Plato (de legibus 784 D.) uses the very phrase—κολάζειν τινὰ πληγαῖς, τιμωρίαις. So also Isocrates, 13 A. Such a κόλασις cannot differ much from τιμωρία, which is the strongest Greek word for *punishment.*

EXCURSUS (3).

ON THE WORD "HELL."

1. This word belongs to the Teutonic languages, and means "the hidden, the invisible place," or "the hollow place,"—the "under-world;" like the Latin *infera* (Fr. *enfer*). It is, curiously enough, of the same etymology as the Latin "cœlum," which designates the hollow, the κοῖλον, the concave *overhead;* this, the concave *underneath;*—thus extremes meet.

2. The Heb. *Sheol* and the Greek *Hades* have only an incidental relation to the meaning of the word "hell," as now ordinarily used; though they are closely allied to it in the analogy of their *etymologies,* and in its own former use. They do not necessarily or naturally imply a place of future torment.

3. The Greek words designating that place of torment, to which "hell" in its present use corresponds, and for which it should be exclusively the translation, are Ταρτᾶρος 2 Pet. 2. 4; ἡ λιμνη τοῦ πυρός Rev. 19. 20; 20. 14, 15; and γέεννα. The latter is the proper and ordinary word for this purpose in the New Testament; although it has no relation to our word "hell" in its etymology. It is used some ten times by our Lord, and by him *only,* with one exception, in James 3. 6.

4. Gehenna (γέεννα) is derived from Hebrew words, signifying the "Valley of Hinnom"—a place near Jerusalem, also called Tophet; where the Israelites had burnt infants in sacrifice to Moloch, where dead bodies were afterwards buried in heaps, where all sorts of filth and offal were deposited, and where fires were kept burning night and day. It became to the Jews the symbol for the place of eternal torment.

5. It is used in the New Testament in this figurative

sense, and in no other. That this is its sense as used by our Lord is clear from a single passage, Luke 12. 4, 5, compared with Matt. 10. 28.

To cast into *hell* (γέεννα) is what man cannot do. God can cast into it the soul as well as the body.

6. If Gehenna is used in the New Testament in any other sense than as designating the place of eternal torment, it is by a sort of reflex figure, just as "hell" may be used in English for extreme inward and moral though temporal torture. In like manner "heaven" also, which, by a figure drawn from the visible firmament, has come to signify the eternal abode of the blessed, may again, by that same reflex figure, be used for any intense moral, though temporal, happiness.

For a full account of the Jewish views of Gehenna, see Campbell's Essay in his "Introduction to the Four Gospels."

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01031 2199